Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-181
Wednesday
20 September 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-181 *20 September 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Baker, Shevardnadze Promise New Initiatives 1
Baker Announces Stance on Strategic Arms *[Moscow International]* 1
Baker Fends Off Criticism *[TASS]* 1
Commentator Previews Talks *[Vorobyev on TASS]* 1
Pogodin Analyzes Bush, Baker Remarks *[Moscow International]* 2
Official Welcomes Inspection of Chemical Sites *[AFP]* 2
Canberra Hosts Chemical Weapons Conference *[PRAVDA 19sep]* 3
U.S. Inspectors View Missile Dismantling *[Moscow TV]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev Conducts 19 Sep News Briefing 4
Welcomes UN Secretary General's Report *[TASS]* 4
Views El Salvador, Nicaragua Issues *[TASS]* 4
Praises India-Sri Lanka Agreement *[TASS]* 4
Supports Committee on Lebanon *[TASS]* 4
TASS Summarizes Briefing 4
United Nations Session Opens With Full Agenda 5
TASS Announces Opening 5
Shevardnadze To Address Assembly *[Moscow Radio]* 5
Garba Elected President of 44th Session *[TASS]* 5
'Top Priority' Debates Perestroyka, Yeltsin Visit *[Moscow International]* 6
Voronin, Nishanov Receive UNEP Head Tolba *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 8
Seminar on Joint Enterprise Zones Opens *[TASS]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

PRAVDA Reports Bush News Conference Remarks 10
TASS Notes Eagleburger's Remarks on Relations 10
U.S. Entry Restrictions for Soviet Refugees Cited *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 10
Cheney Explains U.S. Forces Antidrugs Campaign *[TASS]* 11
More on Zaykov Talk With U.S. Industrialist *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 11
U.S. Senator Knox Visits, Welcomes Perestroyka *[TASS]* 12
Issues Facing U.S. Congress Session Described *[IZVESTIYA 8 Sep]* 12
U.S. Publisher's Complaints 'Unjustifiable' *[TASS]* 13
USSR-Canada Space Scientists Meeting Ends *[TASS]* 13
Montreal 'Peaceful North' Conference Ends 17 Sep *[TASS]* 14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Philippines Considering Joining Nonaligned Movement *[Aleksandrov on Moscow International]* 14
SRV's Vo Chi Cong Stops Over in Moscow 13 Sep *[PRAVDA 16 Sep]* 14
Vietnamese Leaders Send Message of Thanks *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 14
Shifts in Australia's Foreign Policy Expected *[IZVESTIYA 10 Sep]* 15
Supreme Soviet Delegation Heads for New Zealand *[IZVESTIYA 11 Sep]* 15
Supreme Soviet Delegation in Papua New Guinea *[TASS]* 16

Near East & South Asia

Zotov Defends Syrian Military Presence in Lebanon *[Damascus SANA]* 16
Afghanistan's Tanay Cited on Army Preparedness *[TASS]* 17

Sub-Saharan Africa

Reports Cited on U.S. Influence on Angolan Policy *[Moscow International]* 17
Envoy Ustinov Gives Impressions of Namibia Talks *[IZVESTIYA 18 Sep]* 18
Ambassador to Gabon Discusses Economic Reforms *[Libreville Africa No 1]* 19
Soviet Leadership Greets Ethiopia on Anniversary *[PRAVDA 13 Sep]* 19

East Europe

Article Welcomes 'Finlandization' of East Europe *[Migranyan in MOSCOW NEWS No 34]* 20
FRG, West Cast 'Shadow' on GDR 40th Anniversary *[PRAVDA 16 Sep]* 22
15th PZPR Central Committee Plenum Reported *[PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 23
PZPR Legal Expert Meets Chebrikov in Moscow *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 23
Commentators Discuss New Polish Government *[Grachev, Levin on Moscow Radio]* 23
Further Reportage on SFRY's Kadijevic Visit 25
Kadijevic Visits Naval Academy *[TASS]* 25
Kadijevic Leaves on Tour of USSR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Sep]* 25
Defense Secretary Visits Sevastopol *[TASS]* 25
Yazov Accompanies Kadijevic *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Sep]* 26
Yugoslav Peasants' Rally for Reform Noted *[IZVESTIYA 1 Sep]* 26
Ryzhkov Sends Greetings Message to Zagreb Fair *[TASS]* 27
1968 CSSR Intervention Aided 'Conservatives' *[Levada in MOSCOW NEWSNo 34]* 27
CPCZ Audit Commission Visits, Holds Talks *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 28
CSSR Submits Proposal for Normal Ties to Albania *[PRAVDA 11 Sep]* 28
I.P. Aboimov Receives Romanian Envoy Bucur *[IZVESTIYA 1 Sep]* 28
Ryzhkov Condolences on Romanian Ship Sinking *[PRAVDA 12 Sep]* 29

West Europe

Thatcher's 23 Sep Moscow Stopover Previewed *[Moscow International]* 29
Ambassador to Bonn Expected To Return to Moscow *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 18 Sep]* 29
Genscher on Prospects for Achieving Arms Accords *[PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 29
CPSU, FRG Greens Hold Seminar in Moscow *[PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 30

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Text of Gorbachev's Plenum Report on Nationalities *[PRAVDA 20 Sep]* 31
CPSU Central Committee Plenum Continues 20 Sep *[TASS]* 43
Approves Nationalities Platform *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Karimov Opens Debate *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Gostelradio Chairman Addresses Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Volskiy Warns of 'Interethnic War' *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Dagestan Party Leader Speaks *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Yazov Decries Nationalism in Armed Forces *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Further Reportage on 19 Sep Plenum Proceedings 47
PRAVDA Lists Plenum Speakers *[20 Sep]* 47
Vyalyas Addresses Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Maslyukov, Others Speak *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Vorotnikov Addresses Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Prokopyev Addresses Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Kazakh First Secretary Speaks *[Moscow Radio]* 49
More Speakers Address Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Speakers Continue To Discuss Ethnic Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 52
Correction to Report on 19 Sep Proceedings *[TASS]* 53
Sakharov Sees Possibility of Military Coup *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 54
USSR Supreme Soviet Committees Begin Work *[TASS]* 54
Supreme Soviet Press Center Head Describes Job *[Moscow Radio]* 54
CPSU Lacks Procudures for Resignation *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Sep]* 55
Contents of IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS No 9 Noted *[TASS]* 56
Armenian Fuel Reserves Reportedly Depleted *[Moscow Radio]* 57

Vezirov's Remarks 'Infuriate' Armenians *[Yerevan Radio]* 57
Azerbaijan Government Debates Economy, NKAO *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 58
Azerbaijan Terms NKAO Council 'Unconstitutional' *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 27 Aug]* 58
Official Says NKAO Republic Issue *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 26 Aug]* 58
'Hypocritical' Report on NKAO Hit *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 26 Aug]* 59
NKAO Committee Views Troop Presence *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 26 Aug]* 59
Azerbaijan Rail Chief Discusses Sabotage of Trains *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 25 Aug]* 60
12 Go on Trial in Fergana for Rioting *[TASS]* 61
Tashkent 'Friendship' Festival Ends in Violence *[TASS]* 61
KGB Cautions Tajik On Incitements To Ethnic Hatred *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Sep]* 61
Anti-Army Attacks Prompt Baltic Military Address *[IZVESTIYA 19 Sep]* 62
Landsbergis Views CPSU Baltics Statement *[GIMTASIS KRASTAS 31 Aug-6 Sep]* 62
Lithuanian Reader Reacts *[TIESA 30 Aug]* 64
Further on 22 Aug Lithuanian 'Sajudis' Rally *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 25 Aug]* 64
Latvian Party Central Committee Changes Made *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 1 Sep]* 65
Latvian Party Calls for Autonomy Within Federation *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 1 Sep]* 65
Democratic Movement Conference Opens in Leningrad *[TASS]* 67
People's Control Committee Hears of Shortcomings *[Moscow Radio]* 67
KGB Staffers Meet Representatives of 'Memorial' *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Aug]* 67
Radiation 'Disaster' at Moscow Metalworks *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Commission Tours Post-Chernobyl Polluted Areas *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 68

Economic

Pavlov Queried on Finance, Investment Decisions
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 7 Sep] 68
Georgian Economic Sovereignty Plan Published *[TASS]* 73
Defense Industries Striving for Foreign Trade *[TASS]* 74

Military

Border Guards Directorate Marks 50th Anniversary 74
Praised by Central Committee *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 74
Lizichev Attends Ceremonial Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Sep]* 75
Preliminary Findings on Sub Reactor Failure Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Sep]* 75

Baker, Shevardnadze Promise New Initiatives

Baker Announces Stance on Strategic Arms

LD2009073289 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] The U.S. secretary of state, Mr James Baker, has spoken at a news conference in connection with his meeting with the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, in Wyoming on Friday and Saturday. He said the American delegation would make proposals designed to break the deadlock over the issue of nuclear testing.

Radio Moscow's observer recalls that the USSR has repeatedly urged the United States to sign a test ban treaty.

Mr Baker announced that the United States was changing its position in the field of strategic offensive arms. The United States would agree to discuss the issue of mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles if Congress gave the go-ahead to the funding of American missiles of that type.

Baker Fends Off Criticism

LD2009083989 Moscow TASS in English 0824 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 20 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, speaking on Tuesday at his first press conference since he took office, made a statement on the upcoming meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in Wyoming on September 22-23.

In his statement, Baker evidently tried to fend off the mounting criticism of the Bush administration's "wait and see" policy on arms control, the reduction of strategic offensive arsenals and limits on underground nuclear tests.

The United States expect the Soviet Union to "respond positively to our conventional forces initiative," Baker said, without mentioning the latest Soviet initiatives in this sphere and several constructive unilateral Soviet steps.

The United States "will be offering proposals designed to break the 15-year nuclear testing log jam", he said.

The Soviet Union have repeatedly offered the United States to negotiate a complete ban on underground nuclear tests.

"In START we look forward to a positive Soviet response to our verification and stabilisation initiatives." At the same time Baker said that the United States "will lift their ban on mobile ICBM's in start contingent on congressional funding of our mobile ICBM's...and will be instructing their START negotiators in Geneva to work out the appropriate details of limits to be applied to mobile ICBM's and effective verification measures."

"There are about two or three really fundamental, very tough, difficult issues in START...we have not as yet been able to resolve," he said.

"In the area of chemical weapons, we have, I think, a reasonable shot at an agreement to exchange data on chemical stocks which, I think, is a first practical step toward achieving real controls and eventually a total ban."

The discussions will be taking place against a backdrop of significant major changes in the Soviet Union, Baker stressed, saying that the United States recognise the pressure "which the Soviet face" and that "there are no simple or quick fixes to these and no one from the outside can solve these problems for them."

"The general secretary has called the fundamental structural reforms a 'revolution' and we would agree with that characterisation."

"So the question is: What can and what should we do? The answer, I think, to that is that we should find points of mutual advantage, gains that help them but that also, at the same time, serve our interests. This approach requires, of course, some creativity on the part of both of us. I think that this ministerial will reflect that strategy," Baker said.

Commentator Previews Talks

LD2009140989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1214 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 Sep (TASS)—TASS commentator Pavel Vorobyev writes:

Meetings between the USSR foreign affairs minister and the U.S. secretary of state are no longer viewed as something extraordinary. Nonetheless, in the eyes of the international community they have not become routine—certain expectations are linked with each one; each one is carefully forecast prior to taking place and analyzed afterward.

The Soviet Union welcomes statements by U.S. official figures about being interested in the success of perestroyka which, in their opinion, promotes the steady development of East-West dialogue. However, such statements are sometimes followed by highly contradictory reasoning. For instance, recently, voices have been raised stating that the United States should not "subsidize perestroyka," although the soviet Union has not been asking for subsidies. Bewilderment is also produced in Moscow by calls to "hold back" economic cooperation with the USSR until the Soviet economy is radically reformed.

All this reasoning appears to be shortsighted, to say the least, and in forming the atmosphere around the coming political contacts the Soviet side would like to address itself, first and foremost, to the recent positive statements by President George Bush and Secretary of State James Baker.

Practical movement by the U.S. side toward accords on the whole range of questions being discussed by the USSR and the United States could provide the best support for these statements. This would serve mutual interests: The gain from accords on nuclear and space weapons, chemical weapons ban, and reducing conventional armed forces in Europe would appear to be reciprocal, as do gains from the financial point of view.

No less important is the fact that radical arms cuts, settling of regional problems through mutual efforts, and development of economic cooperation would also make it possible to put an end to the spirit of confrontation which for many years has been poisoning only bilateral relations and international politics as a whole.

Pogodin Analyzes Bush, Baker Remarks

LD2009092789 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary]

[Text] The meeting between the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, and the United States secretary of state, James Baker, on the 22d and 23d of this month is giving rise to endless speculations and forecasts concerning its results, and on the 21st, the Soviet minister will be received by President Bush.

I'd also like to take a turn at forecasting, writes our analyst, Aleksandr Pogodin. Of major concern is the slackening in Soviet-American talks on strategic arms. Matters are in no way helped by the White House urging constantly building up United States nuclear potential, as if that might make the Soviet Union more tractable. It should be clear that any attempts to extort one-sided concessions are doomed to failure. It's true, though, that pronouncements of that nature are interspersed with assurances of a desire to make headway in talks on strategic arms.

In his latest press conference, President Bush said that his administration is working on proposals which could appeal to the Soviet Union. It's also known that Eduard Shevardnadze will also bring some new proposals on disarmament to the United States. There is more optimism voiced by experts on such fields as banning and eliminating chemical weapons and ending nuclear tests. A hopeful sign is the statement by James Baker that the United States is about to come up with a proposal permitting to break away from the 15-year long impasse on nuclear explosion, [as heard]. Let's recall that the Soviet Union has been trying for years to agree with the United States on a complete ban on nuclear testing.

Official Welcomes Inspection of Chemical Sites

BK1909065789 Hong Kong AFP in English 0607 GMT 19 Sep 89

[By Tim Cribb]

[Text] Canberra, Sept 19 (AFP)—The Soviet Union is ready to open its most sensitive facilities to world scrutiny as a step to achieving a total ban on chemical weapons, a senior Moscow official said here Tuesday [19 September].

Soviet officials also said they expected good news from talks this week between U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on inspection of chemical weapons stockpiles.

Nikita Smidovich, head of the Soviet delegation at the government-industry conference against chemical weapons which opened here Tuesday, told a news conference that any site or facility would be open to international inspections "and we invite others including the United States to adopt a similar approach."

Mr. Smidovich, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department of Arms Control and Disarmament, said that if there was any kind of exclusion of any facility from an eventual formula "then we create sanctuaries for possible violations of the convention.

"The Soviet Union is ready to admit inspectors to any place or any facility, including the most sensitive of facilities," he added.

Mr. Smidovich was to deliver a paper Wednesday to the 400 conference delegates from more than 60 countries on measures Moscow was taking in support of negotiations for a global convention banning chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union, the United States and Iraq are the only states to admit that they have chemical weapons but an estimated 15-20 countries possess chemical weapons capability, with at least 1 dozen believed to hold them.

The 40-member Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has been negotiating since 1968 a convention to ban the manufacture, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons.

Mr. Smidovich said the four-day Canberra meeting would assist negotiations towards "a multilateral convention, a total ban on chemical weapons."

He said that it was important to have the commitment of world industry to a total ban on chemical weapons and an early conclusion of the convention.

He said a comprehensive ban could only be applied by giving inspectors the freedom to visit facilities anywhere in the world.

Commercial secrets would be guarded by developing appropriate procedures for inspection that safeguard sensitive information not related to chemical weapons, he said, adding that "we are not talking about frivolous inspections."

Verification procedures would be covered by rules of confidentiality.

But some developing countries might feel their national integrity was being compromised if they agreed to inspections, Mr. Smidovich acknowledged.

The meeting of chemical industry and government officials was taking place here as Moscow and Washington were engaged in bilateral chemical weapons talks and Mr. Smidovich said he expected progress at the talks in Wyoming this week between Mr. Baker and Mr. Shevardnadze.

"I am looking forward to hearing good news... by the end of this week from Wyoming," he said.

French delegation leader Philippe Guelley said he also expected good things at Wyoming and added that the Canberra conference reflected the international sensitivity to the chemical weapons issue.

Progress at Geneva had not been spectacular but the framework was there for a possible convention.

"We could finish the negotiations in the next two years," Mr. Guelley, head of his Foreign Ministry's Division of Disarmament and Strategic Affairs, said.

"The next two years will be of utmost importance," he said, adding "we have to finish otherwise the momentum will slow."

Mr. Guelley said that developments in bilateral talks between the Soviet Union and the United States were "very important."

But there must be a limit between confidentiality for industry and the necessity of verification for governments.

France has presented the Geneva conference with a proposal for confidentiality. "Progress on confidentiality leads to progress on verification," Mr. Guelley said.

Canberra Hosts Chemical Weapons Conference

PM1909135389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent A. Ivkin: "Conference in Canberra"]

[Excerpts] Canberra—The international conference of representatives of governments and industry against chemical weapons began to work today, 19 September, in the Australian capital. There are 68 delegations taking part. The conference has been convened at the initiative of the Australian Government with a view to elaborating greater mutual understanding between the governments and producers of the so-called "silent death" and achieving the coordination of their actions for the speediest conclusion of an international convention on the total prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, which is being discussed within the framework of the disarmament conference in Geneva.

The Canberra forum is not formally linked to the Geneva talks, but the organizers reckon that dialogue between the governments and industrialists should encourage the former and the latter to elaborate the practical measures which will be needed for the definitive draft of a convention on banning chemical weapons and for its effective fulfillment. Considering that for a long time measures for monitoring the production of chemical arms, especially in countries with private enterprise, have been a stumbling block at the Geneva talks, the constructiveness of this dialogue would signify considerable progress in the matter of universal disarmament.

In an interview before the start of the congress N. Smidovich, the leader of the Soviet delegation, reported that the Soviet side intends to provide the participants of the Canberra forum with detailed information of the measures which the USSR is taking to prepare for its participation in the future convention on the total prohibition of chemical weapons. "The Soviet Union," he said, "supports the broad participation of representatives of the chemical industry in the actual talks process. We will expound a number of ideas regarding monitoring and the expansion of openness and glasnost with regard to military chemical arsenals." [passage omitted]

The conference does not envisage adopting a final document, but at the concluding session on 22 September it will sum up the proposals which the participants express at the two working sections and the so-called forum of industrialists.

U.S. Inspectors View Missile Dismantling

LD1909175889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian in the "Vremya" program at 1430 GMT on 19 September carries a video report by Correspondent A. Guretskiy from the Lesnaya base in Belorussia, where 232 missiles are due to be eliminated in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of medium-range and short-range missiles.

The video shows rows of R-12 (SS-4) missiles and a group of U.S. inspectors examining them as they are dismantled.

Base Commander Ye.M. Avdeyenko says the following:

"By today, in accordance with the treaty between the USSR and the United States, the task for the elimination of weapons at the R-12 complex has been fulfilled by over 60 percent. Almost 80 percent of the equipment which has been eliminated, including tractors and transportation facilities, has been handed over to the national economy."

Next, D. Dennis, head of the Inspection Group, speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation, says the following:

"The job that we are doing here is very important and is proceeding in accordance with the treaty, the leader of the inspection group from the United States believes. In his opinion, this path should be continued in order to establish a mutually agreed military balance. This path leads to a further improvement in relations between our countries."

The final part of the video shows Guretskiy holding a piece of wood carved from a birch tree with a fragment of one of the missiles inlaid as a souvenir.

Perfilyev Conducts 19 Sep News Briefing

Welcomes UN Secretary General's Report

LD1909140889 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—The annual report of the United nations secretary-general lays the groundwork for determining areas of the international community's future activities and adding a new quality to this global organisation, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a news briefing today.

Vadim Perfiliyev spoke highly of the report, issued on the eve of the 44th U.N. General Assembly session, opening on Tuesday.

He said that "the integral system of views on ways to ensure international security and enhance the U.N. role in the settlement of regional crisis situations, disarmament, and the solution of social, economic, environmental and humanitarian problems, which is contained in the report, is a highly important element."

"The Soviet Union believes that the report's proposals for developing preventive functions of the organisation and maintaining order in the world at the level of high reliability, deserve to be carefully studied," the spokesman said.

Views El Salvador, Nicaragua Issues

LD1909170989 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—The beginning of a dialogue between the Salvadoran Government and the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front was welcomed as a positive development by Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev in his address to a briefing here today.

He especially stressed the importance of the fact that the antagonistic groups had identified specific mechanism of holding dialogue on a regular basis.

Along with this, Perfilyev said, an election process is gaining strength in Nicaragua, where opposition forces are now joining in the process.

The Sandinista government has stated its preparedness for direct talks with the contra leadership on demobilization terms. All this, Soviet spokesman stressed, attests to the fact that the Tela agreements have begun to work, and their realization opens up realistic perspectives for attaining the long-awaited settlement in Central America.

"This state of affairs in the region meets with understanding on our part," Perfilyev stated.

Praises India-Sri Lanka Agreement

LD1909172489 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—The Soviet Union welcomes the Indian-Sri Lankan agreement on the withdrawal of the Indian peace-keeping force from Sri Lanka before December 31, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a news briefing today.

Vadim Perfilyev said that the agreement culminated the long consultations and negotiations aimed at finding an optimum solution to complicated problems that existed between the two countries.

"The Soviet Union thinks that the goodwill and readiness to compromise, displayed by both sides, will ensure that the existing problems will be finally solved in a good-neighbourly spirit and that the political climate in South Asia will be improved," he said.

Supports Committee on Lebanon

LD1909172889 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—The attitude of the Soviet Union toward the resumption of activity by the committee of three on Lebanon is uniformly positive, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

The Soviet Union, he said, is satisfied with, and grateful to Morocco, Algeria and Saudi Arabia for heeding the relevant plea of the Soviet Union and a number of other countries, as well as the unanimous world public opinion on this score and taking up, with renewed force, the cause they were entrusted with by the Casablanca pan-Arab conference.

Serious hope is inspired by the fact that the committee has succeeded, as a result of contacts with numerous countries for which Lebanese settlement is an issue of concern, in working out new constructive proposals aimed at setting the process in motion. The fact reconfirms the committee's considerable potential.

The Soviet Union will provide vigorous support for the committee in future and seek to contribute to the creation of an atmosphere facilitating the progression of the settlement process in Lebanon, Perfilyev stressed.

He said that the Soviet Union has addressed the leaders of a number of Arab countries to advise them of its stance.

TASS Summarizes Briefing

LD1909173189 Moscow TASS in Engish 1544 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman reported the opening of the CPSU Central Committee's plenary meeting at a briefing here today.

Perfilyev touched upon the Indian-Sri Lankan agreement on the withdrawal of the Indian peace-keeping force from Sri Lankan territory before December 31 and noted that the agreement had been received with satisfaction in the Soviet Union. "The USSR believes that mutual goodwill and the readiness for a compromise, displayed by both sides, provide the guarantee that existing problems will be finally settled in a spirit of good-neighbourliness, and help improve the political climate in South Asia."

A Soviet delegation, led by Oljas Suleymenov, a USSR Supreme Soviet member, is going to Cambodia to observe the final stage of the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops from that country, Perfilyev said.

The Soviet Union's attitude to the resumption of activities of the committee of three on Lebanon, is definitely positive, the spokesman said. The USSR will continue rendering energetic support to the committee and actively promote an atmosphere favourable for a settlement process in Lebanon.

Perfilyev noted the significance of the beginning of a dialogue between representatives of the government and the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front of El Salvador. He stressed it was important that the conflicting groups had defined concrete mechanisms for a dialogue on a regular basis. He highly assessed the election campaign in Nicaragua which is involving opposition forces.

Commenting on reports that the U.S. Federal Election Commission submitted to the White House and the U.S. Congress a report on the results of its delegation's visit to the USSR last June, Perfilyev expressed satisfaction over the consolidation of official relations between the Central Electoral Commission for Election of Soviet People's Deputies and the U.S. Federal Election Commission

United Nations Session Opens With Full Agenda

TASS Announces Opening

LD1909211789 Moscow TASS in English 2024 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 20 TASS—The United Nations General Assembly opened its 44th session on Tuesday.

The session agenda includes 150 issues related to peace and disarmament efforts, settlement of regional conflicts, social and economic development, human rights and environment.

Shevardnadze To Address Assembly

LD1909222189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2047 GMT 19 Sep 89

["International Diary" program presented by Georgiy Alekseyev]

[Text] Hello comrades! The 44th session of the UN General Assembly opened in New York today. At the session are delegations from 150 states. They will discuss the problems of consolidating international peace and security, disarmament, settling regional problems, and intensifying the socioeconomic development of states.

According to a statement by Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, an extensive complex of problems regarding nuclear disarmament remains at the center of attention. It is becoming a kind of a main system establishing link in conditions of dialogue on an all-embracing approach to the consolidation of international peace and security. In comrade Petrovskiy's view, the main task of the present session is to promote by all available means, continued progress. It is very important that the United Nations Organization should raise its authoritative voice toward successfully conducting Soviet-U.S. talks, in particular on nuclear and space weapons. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is departing for a visit to the United States this week, is expected to speak at the present sesion of the UN General Assembly.

Garba Elected President of 44th Session

LD1909223489 Moscow TASS in English 2209 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 20 TASS—The 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly opened here on Tuesday. There are 150 items on the session's preliminary agenda. Among them are problems of consolidation of peace and disarmament, settlement of regional conflicts and socio-economic development, human rights and prevention of ecological catastrophe.

The delegates unanimously elected, with no vote taken, Josef Garba, a prominent Nigerian diplomat, permanent representative of Nigeria at the United Nations, as president of the 44th session. He said that the U.N. General Assembly session now opens at a time of significant changes in the world, owing to a consistent improvement in the relations between the two great powers. An atmosphere of confidence has now appeared where earlier there was an atmosphere of fear and mutual suspicion. Growing allegiance of both great powers to joint solution of problems, which earlier seemed insoluble, should be spread to all other areas of our common concern, he said.

'Top Priority' Debates Perestroyka, Yeltsin Visit

LD1809163389 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 17 Sep 89

["Top Priority" program, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov, with deputy directors of the United States of America and Canada Institute Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen? Welcome to "Top Priority." I'm your host, Pavel Kuznetsov, and together with me in the studio are Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov.

Let's today turn back, turn again, to the domestic situation and the subject, the topic, was prompted by several events. One of them is the recent address on television by our president, Mikhail Gorbachev. And I'd like to begin this program by asking you about what you think is the keynote of his address. Is it his warning against rocking the boat by both right and left, or is it his emphasis on discipline, when he said that the standard of living here is determined by how we work or by our attitudes toward whatever we are trusted with; or is it the burning, the acute nationalities issue, which was also raised in that address? Who'd like to begin?

[Bogdanov] My impression is that you find in that address many, many things which, by the way, upset me a little bit, because I believe that in such an important address after such a long time...

[Kuznetsov] After a month, a month's vacation.

[Bogdanov] After a month, yes, but still this is a long time...

[Kuznetsov] In our turbulent times (?it's a long time).

[Bogdanov] In our turbulent, yeah. Our President should have pointed out to some key, key, key problems. But in that address you may find out everything, covering, covering everything, but my feeling...

[Kuznetsov] What you mean is that he should have pointed to some solutions to those problems...

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes.

[Kuznetsov]...Because that statement, that address was stacked with problems anywhere, [as heard] Wherever you looked, problems.

[Bogdanov] This is not kind of a criticism, but this is my, just a feeling, feeling like anybody else in this country.

[Kuznetsov] Well, I think you are perfectly justified to criticize...

[Bogdanov] But if we come back to your question what is there, I believe this is a warning. If you analyze it carefully, if you fix all that into the environment, in the happenings, my feeling is this is a very clear-cut warning to all forces which are destroying, rocking. I would say—no, I would say destroying the society—stroying the society. That's my feeling.

[Kuznetsov] Okay. We know that our president is an outstanding politician and one of his features is that he steers the middle course. And so he continues to call for unity. But the 4 and ½ years of perestroyka, I think, have shown that if you change a political system—and in our case it's a political system that has been very cruel and not fair for decades, so instead of this unity you have irreconcilable interests, irreconcilable conflicts between, say, the bureaucracy and the budding democratic traditions, between the elite who continue to enjoy privileges, although on a far less extensive level, and have-nots who live below the poverty line, it's a conflict between those who want to preserve power, and fear that with power they will lose everything, and those forces who seek power, who want to obtain this political power. So I think that, would you agree with me, Sergey, that steering a middle course in such a situation may even worsen our difficulties, despite the no matter how many warnings you can issue?

[Plekhanov] I'm not sure that steering the middle course is the right way to describe Gorbachev's political tactics. He is committed to democratization. He has emphasized that repeatedly and openly and I think that his whole policy over the past 4 and ½ years is a tribute to that. The problem is how you do it. I mean, this country is, has a tradition, you know, off with their heads. We very easily find enemies, concentrate our anger on them and, you know, work up that anger and just love simple and quick solutions. And I think Gorbachev is entirely correct when he warns the people who are in such a mood that they should think about the consequences of such a supposedly radical approach, because we have a very big and complex society and raising the banner of class struggle in this society would have tremendous consequences, destructive consequences for the society's fabric. The bureaucracy is a problem and the problem of distributing the power which is now concentrated in the hands of the bureaucracy in the society, among the various groups in society, the levels, the various levels in the society, and that's the meaning of democratization. But I don't think that if you simply start, I mean, putting bureaucrats in prison or shooting them or doing whatever that that is the way to really distribute the power. It can only be done by constitutional means, by means of hard and persistent work on building the new democratic institutions. And I think that we are progressing along that way.

[Kuznetsov] Sergey, I disagree with you in one point, and one point is that I have never heard anybody saying that bureaucrats or conservatives should be put in prison or shot to death.

[Plekhanov] No, but some people, some people think that, some supposedly radical people are advocating tough measures against [word indistinct].

[Kuznetsov] What I was trying to bring home is that when our leader keeps saying and now openly says that we have conservatives and radicals, I don't think this, there can be a common ground for unity, because in perestroyka these two radical camps, I mean opposing camps, they seek and see actually very different goals, and trying to reconcile those interests I think is a futile attempt.

[Bogdanov] My point is that for the first time in 5 years so clearly, so clearly cut is definitions: conservatives, reactionaries, middle, right. For the first time....

[Kuznetsov] Radicals.

[Bogdanov] Radicals, we point it out absolutely clearly. First of all, we recognize for the first time that our society is not a homogeneous society. This is a very different society, it means that you should join hands with...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] I think it's about time we started taking sides and perhaps this call for unity is based on the fact that there's a balance of power at the very top and...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] If you, Sergey, insist on the middle of the course—and that was my feeling, that you still believe, personally, you still believe that the middle of the course is the most efficient way in this country, which I fully disagree with you, that's what you mean to suggest to us, what is [word indistinct].

[Plekhanov] I think that politics is the art of the possible. I mean the whole human experience emphasizes that and we must learn the politics of consensus. Unless we do that I think we will lose both perestroyka and democracy.

[Kuznetsov] Okay. Perestroyka featured highly on Boris Yeltsin's tour of the United States. We know that after President Bush walked in on Mr Yeltsin talking to Mr Brent Scowcroft the two gentlemen had a discussion dealing with perestroyka and the problems and everything and they even discussed a 10-point plan to rescue perestroyka, according to Boris Yeltsin. So judging by the coverage of his tour in the Soviet press, I don't think it came as a great pleasure to some people here and, well, one of the examples is a recent article in the newspaper IZVESTIYA, which in my view was terribly one-sided in the sense that it contained statements taken from the U.S. press which were, to my view, denigrating to Boris Yeltsin. Now, what is your feeling about this?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think that it's an important political visit and it is another illustration of the growing pluralism in the Soviet political system.

[Bogdanov] Great liberal, Sergey, you are a great liberal. I am sorry, okay?

[Plekhanov] And I think that Boris Yeltsin has made a number of good points during his tour. At the same time I think that, I don't agree with a number of characterizations that he has made and I think one of our commentators was right when he said that when U.S. political figures go abroad they are rather reticent, they...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] They don't criticize their own government.

[Plekhanov] That's right, they have that tradition. And I think that's a good tradition, that when we go abroad we sometimes, you know, leave some of our domestic quarrels behind.

[Kuzentsov] But I mean, I think that in this particular case it was due to a lack of sophistication as a politician, Boris Yeltsin, he is, he proved that he is one and the same person both here and abroad. What do you feel?

[Bogdanov] What worries me, what worries me and why I am so much in disagreement with liberal Sergey's approach, very humane approach to all that, because this guy is doing everything for himself. And if somebody believes that he is naive, that he is primitive, that he is not very well educated—I do not buy that. He is doing everything deliberately. He is doing his own politics and he went over there to the United States to build up an image of a great international figure. When he comes back from the United States, whatever you may think of his visit, he will come here as a great international leader. He might have brought something, you know, in his pocket, in his pocket to bring to the Soviet people. And I am sorry to say that that would be the beginning of his, you know, very rapid international career, which I cannot accept...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Okay, what's wrong?

[Bogdanov] It is absolutely disgusting.

[Kuznetsov] Radomir, we admire the United States where politicians pursue their political, own political careers and sometimes disagree and very often disagree with the administration. Okay, what's wrong with a Soviet guy pursuing his own political career?

[Bogdanov] Pavel, I snap my fingers at U.S. politicians, I am sorry to say. I am very worried about my own country. I am very worried about my own country, [as heard] I am very worried what will happen to my country tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. Who is going to take it? That's what worries me. I don't care about the United States—this is well established and God bless them. Unfortunately, so far we have no God's blessing. That's what I mean.

[Kuznetsov] Okay, let's continue with perestroyka and Soviet- U.S. relations.

[Bogdanov] I think you don't like that subject, Pavel, what is it...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] No, no no, I am just, we have about 8 minutes left and we have to cover more ground and on this point, perestroyka and soviet.

[Bogdanov, interrupting] You believe that my ground is not important?

[Kuznetsov] Radomir, Radomir, I am moderating here, please. Soviet-U.S. relations and perestroyka. And we know that we have heard some statements from one of the most outspoken members of the Bush administration, who is against any cooperation, economic cooperation with the Soviet Union, and the gentleman is Vice President Dan Quayle, who really doesn't believe, he doesn't want to bail us out as he puts it, as long as we remain what we are. Now I think, Sergey, you call such kind of people squeezers, who want to make the most of our difficulties and in arms control in particular. Now, if we take arms control—the recent statements coming from Washington are kind of ambiguous a little bit, because President Bush is said to be willing to meet with Mikhail Gorbachev at any time, but at the same time the White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater said that the United States is in no hurry. What kind of a political formula is that, to be willing to meet with the Soviet leader at any time and not to be in a hurry on that?

[Plekhanov] Well, first I've got to say that the characterization of some people as squeezers and other people in Washington as dealers is not of my authorship. It was first proposed by Arnold [name indistinct], an expert from the Rand Corporation, in an article in FOREIGN AFFAIRS a few years ago. But the squeezers and the dealers are still there and I think that the administration in Washington is trying to figure out what its course should be vis a vis the Soviet Union at this moment, when there are reports of increasing domestic political difficulties in the Soviet Union, the nationality question, the economic problems and so on. And I understand that there is a temptation on behalf, on the part of people like Dan Quayle, who say, well, you know, why help them out? Let's see what will happen to them, because, you know, you never know how it will turn out and we might bet on the wrong kind of policy. And I think that the background of that approach is really a desire to see the Soviet Union weakened as a power, no matter how. The more difficulties within the Soviet Union, the better, supposedly, for the United States, because the United States would benefit from a weakened position by its traditional competitor.

[Kuznetsov] So when Boris Yeltsin discusses a 10-point plan, or whatever it is, of rescuing perestroyka, well I think he is talking in terms of rescuing not only perestroyka but some of the political figures in the field, so I don't think that this wholesale criticism of what he does, the gentleman does, I don't think it's fair. Okay, we have very little time left and a major event is coming up and this is a plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee which will discuss the nationalities issue. We know that Mikhail Gorbachev has met, has had a meeting with the leaders of the Baltic republics, that is Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and we don't know the details of that meeting yet but I think that one of the points on the agenda was the platform on the nationalities issue that was recently issued by the party. And this platform calls for more economic and even political independence for 15 Soviet republics and also calls for, at the same time calls for cohesion of all those republics within one state. Do you really believe that the plenum is going to settle or diffuse some of the issues? What is your feeling? Almost on the eve of the...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Pavel, to be honest with you and with our listeners I am not sure at all that the plenum is going to diffuse, to soft down [as heard], because what I see, the development of the situation, does not direct in that direction.

[Kuznetsov] What do you think? Radomir sounds like he has completely lost faith in the planning and the thinking abilities of our leadership, which I disagree with.

[Plekhanov] I don't think it's just the planning abilities. I think the problem itself is so complex perhaps the most difficult problem to tackle, we've had to tackle, so far in the past 5 years that I think it will take more than just a plenary meeting, no matter how well prepared, how serious...

[Kuznetsov] There's another session of the congress coming up, so...

[Plekhanov] Right, right, and the congress will continue the work, but I think the plenum can make a major contribution toward a solution to this problem.

Voronin, Nishanov Receive UNEP Head Tolba

PM1909143389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 14 September L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received M. Tolba, UN deputy secretary general and executive director of the UN Environment Program.

On the same day, M. Tolba was received by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities. During the conversation M. Tolba noted the Soviet Union's great contribution to resolving important problems connected with environmental protection and the rational use of natural resources. Questions of developing cooperation between the USSR State Committee for Protection of the Environment and the UN Environment Program were also discussed.

Seminar on Joint Enterprise Zones Opens

LD2009051889 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—The new conditions of economic and foreign economic activities in the Soviet Union put on the order of the day a large-scale experiment of establishing free economic zones on Soviet territory, Ivan Ivanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers' State Foreign Economic

Commission, said at the opening of an international seminar, entitled "joint enterprise zones in countries with centrally planned economy", on Tuesday.

The seminar is held by the U.N. Centre on Transnational Corporations with the assistance of the All-Union Vneshekonomservice Association and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the USSR.

Over 30 reports on problems of establishment and functioning of free trade zones, special economic zones and joint enterprise zones will be delivered before the end of the week.

The seminar is being attended by prominent U.N. experts, Soviet and foreign scientists, operatives, as well as representatives of work collectives of the Soviet regions where joint enterprise zones could be formed in the first place. These are Vyborg, Leningrad, Novgorod, Nakhodka, Odessa and other cities.

The seminar will analyse the experience of joint enterprise zones in such countries as China, Ireland, South Korea, Poland and Yugoslavia. Questions of financial operations in such zones, their links with internal and external economy will be considered.

The international seminar will last till September 22.

United States & Canada

PRAVDA Reports Bush News Conference Remarks

PM2009083789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Bush News Conference"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Sep—U.S. President George Bush, who is on a tour of the northwestern states, held a news conference in the city of Helena (Montana) on Monday, during which he paid considerable attention to the prospects for American-Soviet relations.

Touching on the question of strategic arms talks, the President stated his intention to make progress at them. "We really want to make progress at the strategic arms talks," he said, adding that the administration is working on proposals which could "capture the imagination [privlech vnimaniye] of the Soviet Union." However, Bush stressed that the present American leadership does not intend to back down in its implementation of the "Star Wars" program, although he recognizes that SDI is incapable of providing an "impenetrable shield."

"Mr President, do you not think that it is time to talk about a summit meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev?—one journalist asked. "No, it is now time to talk about a constructive, productive meeting at foreign minister level in Wyoming," the President replied.

The President announced his decision to grant Hungary most favored nation status with the United States. Previously this status, which ensures that lower customs duty is paid on Hungarian goods imported into the United States, was granted only for a fixed period. The President justified the decision by the fact that Hungary "has taken major steps toward political and economic reform.

Asked whether the possibility of similar measures being taken toward the Soviet Union was under consideration, the President said that a whole package of economic problems would be discussed at the upcoming Soviet-American meeting at foreign minister level. "When, however, will you start taking decisions rather than simply saying that you are continuing to study the question?"—one journalist asked, having in mind the granting of most favored nation status to the Soviet Union. "We are merely acting systematically and are approaching, I think, the whole range of relations with the Soviet Union from the standpoint of prudence," the President replied.

TASS Notes Eagleburger's Remarks on Relations

LD1909224589 Moscow TASS in English 2236 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 20 TASS—The United States views negotiations between Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in Wyoming on September 22-23 as part of normal summit relations between the two great powers, Lawrence Eagleberger, assistant secretary of state, said here on Tuesday, addressing an annual assembly of the National Conference on Soviet Jews' affairs.

There is no need to reiterate that the great changes in the character of our exchanges with the Soviet leaders are primarily the result of unprecedented and moving events taking place in the Soviet Union. As these changes are developing, the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union could become the relations of cooperation. We applaud the democratic reforms in the Soviet Union and want them to be a success, he said.

Eagleberger touched upon the administration's policy towards emigrants from the USSR that the United States can receive in the 1990 fiscal year. Washington is known to have introduced restrictions on the number of Soviet citizens to get the right of entry to the United States.

U.S. Entry Restrictions for Soviet Refugees Cited

PM1909092589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Linnik: "I Beg To Disagree": first six paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The numerous comments which PRAVDA received on V. Linnik's report "Metamorphoses" published 22 July this year included a letter from Mr Max N. Robinson, U.S. consul general in Moscow.

"I read with interest the article published in PRAVDA 22 July 1989 on immigration to the United States and I should like to clarify two mistakes in your article," Mr Robinson writes.

"First: The article claims that 'the Bush administration recently changed a clause of immigration legislation in such a way as to impede the entrance to the United States of Jews leaving the Soviet Union.'

"In reality there have been no changes in immigration legislation. Every family which asks for permission to enter the United States as refugees is examined on an individual basis to ascertain whether it can receive this right. Although in fact in many cases those who do not have sufficient grounds for receiving refugee status are offered permanent residence in the United States under other immigration programs. U.S. policy provides for all those who want to emigrate from the USSR to the United States having an opportunity to do so.

"Second: The PRAVDA article claims that our immigration rules state that those who are able to emigrate to another country can be accepted in the United States only 'on general grounds' but not as refugees. In reality approximately 80 percent of Soviet citizens who have emigrated with Israeli visas and have decided in Vienna or Rome to travel to the United States instead have been deemed worthy of refugee status. In the U.S. Embassy in

Moscow approximately 20 percent are examined under the refugee program and 80 percent are offered entry under other programs."

We familiarized the author of the "Metamorphoses" report with the U.S. diplomat's letter. Here is his reply:

New York—Esteemed Mr Robinson!
I shall not conceal the fact that the attention of U.S. officials toward the article "Metamorphoses" flatters my vanity as a journalist and confirms that our newspaper raises subjects of substance for deepening mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States across the entire spectrum of our relations.

The article appeared with references to opinions frequently cited in the U.S. press, which is often informed of secret and proposed moves of U.S. policy long before a particular government decision becomes official. Something similar happened on this occasion, too.

That is why I venture immediately to disagree with your assertion that "there have been no changes in U.S. immigration legislation." Mr Consul, you are right only in the letter of your missive: Immigration legislation has not yet been changed officially. But the administration has already submitted to Congress a plan which makes very substantial changes to this legislation. In addition for some time now the relevant U.S. departments have been guided by the spirit of the changes which are now being introduced in their daily policy in the immigration field.

To substantiate this claim I cite very recent items in the U.S. press. On 3 September THE NEW YORK TIMES reported a plan, prepared by the State Department in conjunction with the CIA, the FBI, and the U.S. immigration service, for changes in the country's immigration legislation. This plan, the newspaper writes, "will substantially restrict the right of Soviet Jews to come to the United States as political refugees." "To all appearances, U.S. policy in the field of Jewish emigration is undergoing a 180 degree turn"—that is the opinion of another respectable newspaper, THE WASHINGTON POST, in its 7 September issue.

What is the essence of the changes? I shall give an account of them once again on the basis of items from THE NEW YORK TIMES 12 September issue in front of me. According to an interdepartmental plan of the administration, the ceiling for "refugees" from the USSR would seem to increase from 43,500 places this year to 50,000 next. But, first, the administration will pay the resettlement expenses of only 40,000 "refugees" for the year to come (and not for all 43,500, as was the case this year). Second, the number of people wanting to leave the USSR (according to U.S. calculations) may be nearly twice as big as the set quota.

The plan then stipulates that after 30 September this year the United States will examine requests for granting "political refugee" status to Soviet emigres only at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. The Israeli visas issued after that date, which had previously given those emigrating from the USSR the right to demand entry to the United States as "political refugees," will henceforth be viewed by the U.S. Government as grounds for supposing that their owners intend to travel to Israel.

Thus I believe that the facts available today definitively dispel the misunderstandings which you may have had, Mr Robinson, in connection with the article in PRAVDA 22 July this year.

Cheney Explains U.S. Forces Antidrugs Campaign

LD1809213289 Moscow TASS in English 2124 GMT 18 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 19 TASS—U.S. Defence Secretary Dick Cheney said at a Pentagon news briefing on Monday that he had sent a message to all the commanders-in-chief of the united and specified commands informing them that "reducing the flow of drugs into the United States is a high priority national security mission."

Cheney ordered the military leaders to draw up plans by October 15 to stem the flow of narcotics in their areas of responsibility.

"I believe that our military forces have the capability to make a substantial contribution toward drug interdiction," the secretary said, adding, however, that the Pentagon is not going to take over the functions of law enforcement agencies.

Cheney set forth tasks to be performed by the U.S. Armed Forces as part of President George Bush's large-scale war on drugs.

He said that one of the major foreign policy objectives of the Bush administration was to reduce the flow of narcotics into the United States and stop it, if possible.

Cheney said that in the past few years the Pentagon had participated in efforts to combat drug-trafficking, spending a total of 72,000 hours of flying time and 7,000 days of sea patrolling.

Two special groups were set up to coordinate anti-drug operations in the Caribbean and on the U.S. Pacific coast.

Cheney said measures were being taken to create a network of radars along the border. Besides, the North American Aerospace Defence command will be used to detect drug traffic across the border.

More on Zaykov Talk With U.S. Industrialist

PM2009083989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Project Looking to the Future"]

[Text] The conversion that has begun at Soviet defense enterprises has opened up extensive opportunities for

switching many of Moscow's scientific institutions and plants to civilian use and involving them in international cooperation.

This was stressed at a 16 September meeting between L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politbureau, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee, A. Paulson, director of the U.S. aircraft firm Gulfstream Aerospace, and M.P. Simonov, general designer at the P.O. Sukhoy Experimental Design Bureau.

Following the dazzling success enjoyed by Soviet aircraft equipment at the Le Bourget Airshow (France), the U.S. firm proposed to the P.O. Sukhoy Experimental Design Bureau a plan for the joint development and production of supersonic passenger airliners and their sale in the world market. Arriving in Moscow, our transatlantic partners visited a number of the capital's enterprises and had talks at the USSR Ministry of the Aircraft Industry, where the Soviet aircraft builders reaffirmed their readiness to develop cooperation in every possible way.

The talks, which were held at the request of the American guests, discussed specific issues linked with accelerating the implementation of the project and eradicating obstacles. It was stressed that such cooperation is a specific manifestation of the successful implementation of the principles of new thinking and, under the conditions of conversion, any such initiative should be welcomed.

U.S. Senator Knox Visits, Welcomes Perestroyka

LD1409142589 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 14 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—A visiting U.S. senator stressed the importance of high-level political contacts to enable business communities in his country and the Soviet Union to promote economic cooperation in a TASS interview today.

Senator Andrew Knox (Delaware), who heads a delegation of Delaware Valley business and political leaders to the Soviet Union and several other East European nations, singled out the forthcoming meeting in Wyoming between Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Secretary of state James Baker, which he described as "one step forward" in the process of developing bilateral relations.

He added, though, that he does not expect any "drastic" results from that meeting.

Asked about the main objectives of his current tour, Knox said: "We are investigating long-range trade possibilities as well as potential joint ventures promoting investing in the United States and specifically Delaware."

"My basic philosophy is that economic and cultural relations will keep our two countries out of war and I think that success of perestroyka is big part of it."

That was why, the senator remarked, "we are most anxious for perestroyka to succeed in the Soviet Union because we know that it is in our best interests and mankind's best interests."

"People in the United States are most enthusiastic about perestroyka," he added.

Speaking about prospects of Soviet-American economic cooperation, Knox said that he was "impressed by the openness and willingness of the Soviet people to admit that they have problems, and being specific about them."

"We have our problems, too, and when people are willing to admit their problems and try to analyse them it is easier to resolve them," he said.

Sen. Knox praised the hard work that Soviet people are doing to create the internal structure for integration into the world economy.

Sharing his personal impressions of the visit to the USSR, the American senator replied that he was "pleasantly surprised" by the Soviet people's striving towards cooperation. He was also greatly impressed by Russian architecture, especially Kremlin cathedrals.

Issues Facing U.S. Congress Session Described

PM1409151389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent L. Koryavin dispatch: "USA: Congress After the Holidays"]

[Text] The 101st U.S. Congress has resumed work after the summer holidays.

And in the Capitol sharp debates flared up from the very first day onward. The main question is appropriations for the new fiscal year. By tradition, it begins in the United States on 1 October. There is little time left, and the federal budget still has not been worked out. The House of Representatives has adopted 30 bills on appropriations for Fiscal Year 1990, while the Senate has only adopted 4. So in the remaining time a full schedule of discussions is expected.

The sharpness of the debates reflects the deployment of forces in Congress today. The emergence of a Democratic majority in both houses has created many difficulties for the Republican administration. Many of its programs, particularly the military ones, are going through with difficulty. A number of drafts, for example on MX missiles, on "Midgetman" mobile missiles, and on the creation of an invisible "Stealth" aircraft and a major "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) program, were cut down in the House of Representatives.

Polemics have arisen around the strategic anti-drugs plan which has just been proposed by the administration. Congress actively supported the idea itself, but sharply asked where the billions needed for its practical implementation were going to be found.

The main difference of opinion in Congress was on the following point: President Bush supports appropriations without raising taxes, while the Democrats maintain that this cannot be done. Since the administration is refusing to finance an extended anti-drug addiction campaign at the expense of reductions in its military budget, the danger emerges of a reduction in social programs. A vicious circle arises, in which a war is to be waged against the evil of narcotics at the expense of the interests of millions of ordinary Americans—pensioners, students, and the needy.

Congress is planning to adopt a number of laws on aid to foreign states. This includes Poland. And here questions arise about the limits of the appropriations. The president himself talks about wanting to grant more subsidies to Poland, but he cannot ignore the serious problems confronting his administration, one of which is the federal budget deficit.

The deficit question is one of the most topical on the agenda of the 101st Congress. The White House and Capitol Hill have agreed to reduce it by $13 billion. However, that agreement is still wandering in the labyrinths of committees. The legislators cannot yet concretely determine on which points and in what proportions expenditure should be reduced. If these calculations are not finished by 1 October, the reduction will take place automatically—at the expense of the same social programs.

Another administration initiative provoking constant interest is the draft law on ethics, which has also been the subject of debate in Congress. It tightens up laws on legislators' receiving fees for speeches, articles, and books, and also their receiving all kinds of rewards and gifts. The agenda for debate also includes a bill on environmental protection—"clean air," as it is called. The question of combating air pollution is given great significance in the United States, and dozens of organizations in virtually all the states support the bill, particularly those where a higher percentage of emissions of industrial waste into the atmosphere is observed.

Finally, the Senate is continuing the discussion of administration candidacies for the government apparatus. Altogether over 300 people are having to pass the Senate. At the moment 160 vacancies are not yet confirmed, including many assistant secretaries, ambassadors, and other high officials. In this connection journalists are saying ironically that half the posts in the administration are "on autopilot."

U.S. Publisher's Complaints 'Unjustifiable'

LD1409213489 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 14 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Gennadiy Maltsev, head of the press centre of the Moscow International Book Fair, said the complaints of Ellendia Proffer, representative of the American publishers Ardis, were unjustifiable. Proffer complained to reporters that some books of the publishers were not allowed to be displayed, that there were delays about issuing the entrance visa to her, and that the organisers of the fair which is in its third day in Moscow put obstacles to ordinary visitors.

In an interview to TASS Maltsev said that neither the customs house of the USSR, nor experts of the USSR State Committee for Publishing, the sponsor of the fair, prohibited the display of any of Ardis firm's publications.

A certain delay about the issuing of the visa was connected with a large work load of technical personnel issuing documents, and not with political considerations as Ellendia Proffer claims, Maltsev said.

The Soviet spokesman said that the current Moscow Book Fair, unlike the previous ones, has a marked commercial tendency and that the organisers of the fair are striving to create the utmost opportunities for businessmen and representatives of publishers and book selling firms. No one but Ms. Proffer among the almost 2,000 participants in the fair complained about bans on the displaying of publications for political reasons, Maltsev said. He also said that any person can buy a ticket and visit the fair from two p.m. daily. The morning is assigned for meetings of experts and conclusion of deals. This routine is customary for similar book fairs in other countries. The book fair in which firms of more than 60 countries and 12 international organisations participate closes on Monday. On Saturday and Sunday the fair will be open to visitors from ten a.m. till late in the evening.

USSR-Canada Space Scientists Meeting Ends

LD1409214489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1322 GMT 14 Sep 89

[Text] Kiev, 14 Sep. (TASS)—A bilateral meeting of scientists here concluded today, with the signing of a protocol extending the joint work of scientists from the USSR and Canada in studying space and using it for peaceful purposes.

Commenting on the results of the work, Albert Galeyev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Space Research Institute and a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, pointed out that the cooperation included such areas as Sun-Earth physics, astrophysics, radio astronomy, space materials science and space biology and medicine. "At the meeting in Kiev," the scientist said, "we proposed supplementing these areas with a complex of studies of the earth from space. This problem is becoming particularly urgent nowadays. It relates, above all, to ecology and to the study of the earth's natural resources."

"Very good relations have developed between Soviet specialists and ourselves," said Barry Wetter, director of Canada's space research programs. "The research into Sun-Earth physics and space medicine can be cited as an

example of successful joint work. We are now preparing for the carrying out of joint experiments in the Soviet satellite Biokosmos."

Also discussed in Kiev was the question of the sides' cooperation in manufacturing on-board instruments for new projects aimed at creating space and X-ray telescopes. The Canadian side will supply an optical instrument for observing the Aurora Borealis.

Montreal 'Peaceful North' Conference Ends 17 Sep

LD1809124289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0925 GMT 18 Sep 89

[Summary] Montreal, 18 Sep (TASS)—TASS correspondent Anatoliy Lazarev reports that the conference for a peaceful north, which was attended by representatives of eight northern countries, including the USSR, has ended. Aspects relating to the economic development of Arctic and northern regions, ecological protection and demilitarization were at the forefront of debate, the results of which were summed up on the final day, Sunday. "Addressing those assembled, V.N. Sedykh, deputy chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee, stressed 'the readiness of the USSR Government to discuss and adopt appropriate measures aimed at demilitarization of the Arctic.' This aim, he said, can, however, be achieved only by way of joint efforts." The final document of the conference calls for a "zone of peace" in the Arctic and norther regions. In an interview with the TASS correspondent, one of the conference organizers, Quebec Peace Committee President Jean St. Denis "stressed that activists in the fight for a peaceful North welcome the Soviet Union's initiatives designed to bring about the creation of a zone of peace in the region. We hope that agreement in this sphere will be reached during the course of the visit to the USSR by Brian Mulroney, the Canadian prime minister, which is planned for November of this year."

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Philippines Considering Joining Nonaligned Movement

HK1509035989 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 14 Sep 89

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] The Philippines has a good chance of being accepted by the Nonaligned Movement. This was declared in Manila by Foreign Affairs Under Secretary Jose Ingles after his arrival from Yugoslavia. A delegation from the Philippines went as observers to attend the conference which involved heads of state of the nonaligned nations.

The declaration by Under Secretary Inglis would be relevant if the forthcoming talks with the United States on the issue of the military bases result in the desired aim—which is to do away with the American military presence. The present military agreement does not give the Philippines the right to be a member of the Nonaligned Movement.

The combined efforts of the Movement have, among other things, succeeded in preventing human rights' violations, a process in which the Philippines has long wanted to join. Entry to the Nonaligned Movement requires responsibility towards international goals as well as a commitment to national security, according to the Philippine under secretary. It makes sense for the Philippines to join the Nonaligned Movement. Everyone knows that as 1991 draws closer, as the military bases agreement with the United States expires, Filipino perceptions about the country's various options are changing.

The present situation is reflected by the Philippine Senate in which 15 out of 23 senators are opposed to the extension of the bases treaty. Hence it is obvious that there will be no ratification of any agreement, should the government approve it. There are other forces in the country actively protesting the retention of the military bases. Officials in the town of Catarman in northern Samar agree with the position taken by the 15 senators.

Meanwhile the government has still not declared its exact position on the matter of the bases. However a statement made by President Corazon Aquino said that any decision on the bases will be based on the Filipinos' national interests. Negotiations with the Americans are expected to begin in December, at which time we will find out if it will be possible for the Philippines to join the Nonaligned Movement.

SRV's Vo Chi Cong Stops Over in Moscow 13 Sep

PM1909134589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report "En Route for Home"]

[Text] An SRV delegation headed by Vo Chi Cong, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the SRV State Council, visited Moscow 13-15 September en route for home from Baghdad.

The delegation was met and seen off at the airport G.S. Tarazevich, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Also present was Nguyen Manh Cam, SRV ambassador to the USSR.

Vietnamese Leaders Send Message of Thanks

PM1509091189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[SRV party and state leaders' message of thanks to USSR leaders]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet

To Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

We express our sincere gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers, and all the fraternal Soviet people for their good wishes on the SRV's national day—the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of our country's independence.

The Vietnamese people always remember and highly value the great assistance and valuable support which the CPSU, the Soviet Government, and the Soviet people give to the cause of the Vietnamese revolution.

We deeply believe that the relations of friendship and all-around cooperation between the Soviet Union and Vietnam will continue to develop and strengthen in accordance with the line of perestroyka and renewal adopted by the CPSU and the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] and by the Soviet Union and the SRV.

We wish the fraternal Soviet people success in implementing the policy of perestroyka advanced by the 27th CPSU Congress.

[Signed] Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee
Vo Chi Cong, chairman of the SRV State Council
Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers
Le Quang Dao, chairman of the SRV National Assembly

Shifts in Australia's Foreign Policy Expected

18070758 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by V. Mikheyev, IZVESTIYA's own correspondent in Sydney: "Fruitful Dialogue"]

[Text] **After many years of having been disconnected from other parts of the world and orienting itself toward senior partners—at first Great Britain, then United States—Australia now selects its own foreign policy and foreign economic priorities and is getting to know its role and place in the system of international relations. Perestroyka in the Soviet Union is treated with great interest in Australia.**

These factors explain the exceptionally joyful reception for the first delegation of the new Soviet parliament which made its visit to Australia on 9 September. It was headed by the Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Nikolay Ivanovich Dementey. This is what the head of the Soviet delegation said in an interview with Soviet journalists:

We felt that our visit was expected and prepared for. Our fellow conferees were familiar with Soviet proposals for the Asiatic-Pacific Region (APR) which were formulated in the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk speeches of M.S. Gorbachev when he spoke at the Congress of Peoples' Deputies. Before answering the question about the possibility of our countries coming closer, Prime Minister R. Hawke warmly remembered his encounters with Soviet leaders in Moscow and announced that he personally intends to contribute to the realization of all the talks completed between us. The Governor-General of Australia, U. Hayden, spoke in the same key having emphasized the importance of removing the residual suspicion—this unfortunate leftover of the past.

Australia, one can conclude, is psychologically ready to support the second step of the relaxation policy, dealing this time with the APR. This became apparent in the unanimity on questions of disarmament, creation of nuclear-free zones, liquidation of chemical arsenals, etc. The two sides were also unanimous when discussions turned to the Australian proposal not to begin work on and mining of mineral ores in the Antarctic, and instead of its utilitarian economic use, change it into a scientific laboratory, a preserve for the world.

The minister of foreign affairs, G. Evans, continued N.I. Dementey, accented tight strategic cooperation with the United States, basing his reasoning on the so-called joint military objectives on complying with the bilateral alliance obligations within the ANZUS framework. For Australia, the presence of the United States in the region is regarded as a factor of stability. In response our delegation explaining the position of the USSR: We never try to improve our relations with anybody at the expense of third countries. We see a possibility of bringing the positions of the USSR and Australia closer without encroaching on interests of third parties.

The conduct of the meeting and discussions, noted N.I. Dementey, have shown that activating Soviet-Australian cooperation in Australia is completely possible, both in political and economic spheres, and that both sides are interested in it. The visit fully justified the expectations placed in it from the viewpoint of deepening ties, and increased trust and understanding between two countries and peoples.

The Soviet delegation had useful exchanges of views in the Senate and later joint committees on foreign affairs, defense and foreign trade, and with a newly-organized parliamentary group on development of friendly ties between Australia and the USSR.

For the new Supreme Soviet of the USSR and Supreme Soviets of union republics, N.I. Dementey stated, the work experience of the Australian Parliament is highly interesting. First is the organizational side, the legislative process, equipment and method of preparation for hearings on separate questions.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Heads for New Zealand

PM1909102789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Visit to New Zealand"]

[Text] Auckland, 10 Sep—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by N.I. Dementyev, deputy chairman

of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, today began an official visit to New Zealand at the invitation of the country's parliament.

The visit is a new stage in the developomeat of links between the two parliaments. The people's deputies will meet with New Zealand Prime Minister Geoffrey Palmer and with a number of government ministers, including Foreign Minister Russell Marshall. The delegation will have conversations with House of Representatives speaker Kerry Burke, with the members of the parliamentary committee on foreign affairs and defense, which is headed by the well-known activist in the struggle for peace and disarmament Sonia Davis, with the leaders of the parliamentary opposition, and with Kenneth Douglas, president of the New Zealand Trade Union Council.

A meeting is also scheduled with representatives of New Zealand business circles engaged in trade with the Soviet Union and with the country's public.

Supreme Soviet Delegation in Papua New Guinea

LD1509195989 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 15 Sep 89

[Text] Port Moresby September 15 TASS—By special TASS correspondent Aleksey Voronin:

A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by Nikolay Dementey, vice-president of the USSR Supreme Soviet and president of the Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, arrived in the independent state of Papua New Guinea for an official visit at the invitation of parliament of that insular South Pacific country.

Soviet people's deputies had meetings and conversations with Papua New Guinea parliamentarians and politicians today.

The delegation met with Prime Minister Rabbie Namaliu. Questions of bilateral relations and cooperation were considered and regional aid international problems of mutual interest were discussed. Soviet parliamentarians narrated to the Papua New Guinea prime minister about the USSR's stand vis-a-vis the Asia-Pacific region and recalled the peace initiatives which were put forward by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk.

Namaliu appreciated the Soviet political course in that part of the world and expressed the hope for broader mutual cooperation.

Development of relations and contacts between legislators of both countries was discussed at a meeting with parliament speaker Denise Young. This is the first ever visit in the history of relations between the Soviet Union and Papua New Guinea, and the interlocuters pledged to put relations between the two parliaments on a systematic basis and to regularly exchange visits.

The visit of the Soviet parliamentary delegation is taking place at a remarkable period for the relations between the two states: the mutual decision has recently been taken to open the USSR's Embassy in Port Moresby and Papua New Guinea's Embassy in Moscow.

Near East & South Asia

Zotov Defends Syrian Military Presence in Lebanon

JN1909101689 Damascus SANA in Arabic 0840 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 19 Sep (SANA)—The USSR ambassador to Syria, Aleksandr Zotov, has praised Syria's distinguished place in the Middle East and Soviet-Arab relations.

Addressing a news conference at the Soviet Foreign Ministry yesterday, Zotov described Syria as a basic key state in the Middle East and in Arab-Soviet relations.

Zotov affirmed that Syria is given close attention because it is a very important Middle Eastern state with a key role in that region, in Lebanon, and particularly in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Zotov described Syrian-Soviet relations as multifaceted and very developed in all directions, saying both countries' viewpoints on many issues are also identical.

The Soviet ambassador expected the Arab Tripartite Committee's efforts to produce positive results, depending on the right internal conditions in Lebanon and continuous Arab support.

Zotov noted that although Syria is not a party to the Lebanese conflict, it is Lebanon's neighbor and an important factor in the situation there. The ambassador denied the existence of any differences between the USSR and Syria concerning a Middle East settlement.

Regarding the situation in Lebanon and Syria's position on it, the Soviet ambassador affirmed that the Syrians are sincere when they declare that the Lebanese issue cannot be solved militarily. He said Damascus has always called for Lebanese dialogue and an accord to help set up a central government representing the interests of all Lebanese. The Syrian position on Lebanon is constructive, he added.

On the presence of Syrian forces in Lebanon, the ambassador affirmed that a Syrian military withdrawal from Lebanon would upset the balance of power there and not lead to positive results.

The Soviet ambassador concluded his news conference by saying that no Arab agrees to withdrawing Syrian forces from Lebanon and keeping Israeli forces there. He asserted that the Syrian forces' withdrawal from Lebanon will not benefit the Arabs, because the Syrian presence is aimed at maintaining the balance of power in Lebanon. Syrian forces are a part of this desirable balance, he said.

Afghanistan's Tanay Cited on Army Preparedness

LD1909191889 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Kabul September 19 TASS—By TASS special correspondent Vladimir Bogachev and Georgy Shmelev:

The Afghan Armed Forces have demonstrated in the past few months their high combat preparedness and ability to defend the people and the country themselves, Afghan Defence Minister Colonel-General Shahnawaz Tanay told TASS.

After the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the country, he said, the enemy staged major military operations near Jalalabad, Khowst and Qandahar, but with no success. The rebels failed to seize any strategic town, all the main settlements of the country are under the government's control.

"Our enemies will not be able on their own to overthrow the legitimate government of the Republic of Afghanistan," the defence minister stressed. "We are not carried away by the successes, but the fact is that our fighting men became more confident of their strength. The troops acquired a wealth of experience, they had good training. The management of the units, their logistical supplies improved."

"Counter-revolutionary formations sustained heavy losses in the course of the fighting, their morale became low, they no longer believe in their ability to succeed. Strife intensified in the rebel camp. Artillery bombardments and missile attacks on towns became more frequent after failures in the battlefield. Innocent Afghans—women, children and old men are killed. It has become clear to all that the extremists are fighting their own people. They have lost their prestige.

"Washington and Islamabad have sharply increased deliveries of the latest weapons to the rebels. American and Pakistani advisers are taking part in operations, but to no avail. The American strategy in Afghanistan is wrong, since Washington seeks a settlement by force of arms, whereas its allies are no longer able to achieve a military victory."

"All wars, big or small, end, sooner or later," the minister said. "President Najibullah proposed a realistic way to peace in our country at the recent 9th, nonaligned summit conference in Belgrade. The Afghan problem can only be settled by political not military means. I am confident that peace will come to our long-suffering land and the people will have a happy and calm life."

Tanai expressed gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet people for the disinterested help and support to Afghanistan.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Reports Cited on U.S. Influence on Angolan Policy

EA1909225689 Moscow International Service in Swahili 1730 GMT 18 Sep 89

[Text] Because of recent events, the situation in southwestern Africa has attracted the attention of many people. Last week in Havana, a tripartite commission comprising Cuba, the RSA, and Angola met to discuss implementation of the agreement on settling the conflict in South-West Africa, which was reached in New York in December last year. The situation in Namibia was on the agenda. And today, leaders of eight African states are meeting in Kinshasa to discuss ways of securing peace in Angola.

This may be a concidence, but the fact remains that the two issues are related. It is not possible to solve the problems in South-West Africa through confrontation, because that is not the way to solve conflicts. A solution to the current problem depends on the situation inside Angola. A settlement in Namibia cannot be expected unless the war in Angola is brought to an end.

But the peace process in that country is at a standstill. The cease-fire agreement reached at Gbadolite, Zaire in June was violated by the National Union for the Total Indepedence of Angola [UNITA] a few days later. As the eight African heads of state and government gather in Kinshasa, the agreement has been officially abandoned because of Savimbi's announcement that he does not intend to respect it. UNITA has boycotted talks with the Government of Angola, and continues to do so. If the reason for such a decision is differences of interpretation arising from the translation of the Gbadolite accord, that is not convincing. The problem lies in the position of those who control Savimbi's activities.

As Namibia's independence draws nearer, the need to end the war which UNITA is unable to [word indistinct] is becoming increasingly clear, especially to the United States, in order to create a stable atmosphere for economic activities. Certain forces are proposing to introduce laws aimed at attracting the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola government into the Western camp. But this is opposed by the CIA. According to newspaper reports, CIA officials think that the guarantees for U.S. control of Angola are not strong enough. That being the case, the U.S. should not abandon UNITA.

The result is as follows: The U.S. State Department has suggested that UNITA's plan to form a government of national reconciliation should be supported, and that elections leading to power-sharing in Angola should then be held. It is plain that an attempt to influence the results of the current Kinshasa meeting is being made. Savimbi has suggested that the mediator in the negotiation process should be changed. Maybe this is because, at the previous meeting of the eight African leaders in Harare, President Mobutu was compelled to acknowledge the

illegality of UNITA's demands. Savimbi did not mention whom he would like to have as a mediator, but it is not difficult to (?guess) what such a person (?wants).

Envoy Ustinov Gives Impressions of Namibia Talks

PM1809134189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with special envoy V.A. Ustinov by own correspondent A. Kamorin in Havana: "Namibia: Some 7 Weeks Before the Elections"; date of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Havana—The latest session of the trilateral commission created to promote the implementation of the agreements on a settlement in South-West Africa signed in New York in December last year has ended in the Cuban capital.

The commission includes Angola, the Republic of South Africa [RSA], and Cuba. The USSR and the United States have observer status. In addition the session was attended by representatives of the United Nations and UNTAG—the UN Group for aid to Namibia in the transitional period. The commission worked in private. I asked the head of the Soviet delegation, special envoy V.A. Ustinov, to impart his impressions of the present round of these important talks in Havana.

[Kamorin] Vyacheslav Aleksandrovich, what in you view is the importance of the Havana meeting, which the world press has in general perceived as "ordinary?"

[Ustinov] I cannot agree with that assessment, if only because the trilateral commission itself is very out of the ordinary. Countries which do not maintain even minimal diplomatic relations with each other are taking part in its work. Nonetheless the commission is working and its sphere of attention includes not only the problem of Namibia's independence, which is the most heavily laden right now, but also the entire complex of situations connected with a settlement in South-West Africa. It is true, and I should like to stress this, that in no event are we seeking to usurp the United Nations, which has a mandate to organize this entire process. Although circumstances sometimes dictate other forms of activity to us. I recall the April events, when the situation in Namibia became acutely aggravated and the UNTAG contingent had not yet been deployed. At the time the commission's active intervention helped to resolve the crisis with relatively "little bloodshed." During those days the commission proved its effectiveness, although it was subjected to some criticism for somewhat exceeding its powers. Incidentally, it was then that the Soviet delegation came out with the initiative to invite UN representatives to sessions of the trilateral commission. As for the present session, its extraordinariness is determined primarily by the importance of the moment—just 7 weeks remain until the elections in Namibia.

[Kamorin] What are the main problems facing the commission today?

[Ustinov] In my view the settlement process in general is proceeding toward its set goal despite all the difficulties, and they are many. The question of the dissolution of "Koevoet"—paramilitary anti-insurgent formations created in Namibia in the past—was raised very keenly at the session. It was clear from the outset that these formations should be dissolved. But on the pretext of the April events these formations were included in the RSA police. Yet they continue to act "in the Koevoet style," terrorizing the population. The importance of this issue is borne out if only by the fact that it was discussed not only in our commission but also in the UN Security Council.

The most important problem is the elections. The election law has not yet been elaborated yet. I repeat, only 7 weeks remain to the elections. The sides are strenuously discussing aspects of the voting procedure and guarantees of its democratic nature.

A third important question: The correlation between the competence of the Namibian Constituent Assembly, which is to emerge as a result of the elections, and of the RSA representatives in the general administration. That is the "background" against which the present talks in the commission took place.

[Kamorin] How far did the news of the murder on Tuesday in Namibia of Anton Lubowski, one of the leaders of the South-West African People's Organization, influence the progress of the talks?

[Ustinov] This fact did of course introduce certain complications. But it had no substantial influence on the atmosphere of the session because all sides, including the RSA, denounced the murder. It is so far unclear whether this was a political crime, but in the future it could have grave consequences.

[Kamorin] What in your view are the results of the Havana session and will it be enough for the commission to have no need to meet once again before the elections in Namibia?

[Ustinov] As a whole, as a result of the exchange of opinions we have formed a sufficiently clear picture of where we are today on the path toward a settlement and what we have to do in the future. I believe that this meeting ended with a satisfactory outcome, although without impressive breakthroughs.

As for readiness for the elections—that question has still not been definitively resolved. It is most likely that there will be one more session before the voting in Namibia and, according to the rules of rotation, it should take place in the RSA. The point here is not the inadequacy of these talks, it is simply that very likely new problems requiring the exchange of opinions will arise before the talks. That was the general viewpoint of all the delegations. But no final decision was taken on the date for the commission's new session.

Ambassador to Gabon Discusses Economic Reforms

AB1809080889 Libreville Africa No 1 in French 1830 GMT 17 Sep 89

[Text] The Soviet Union needs fresh money to reduce its budget deficit by half next year. It needs in all 28.8 billion CFA francs to continue its economic policy reforms. I have on the line Yuriy Shmanevskiy, the Soviet ambassador to Gabon:

[Begin recording] [Reporter] Mr Ambassador, what are the guidelines for this process of economic reforms adopted by the Gorbachev administration?

[Shmanevskiy] It is an economic decentralization process—the decentralization of the entire state economic machinery. Second, all federal republics will manage their own economies. Third, all enterprises will be economically independent and manage their own affairs. This is just the beginning. A new legislation is under way in the field of national economy. In the near future, the second congress of the people's legislators will study laws that will enable the adoption of the reforms.

[Reporter] The reform policy, Mr Ambassador, has been severely criticized within the Soviet political machinery. Despite all these difficulties, are you optimistic about the success of all these reforms?

[Shmanevskiy] First of all, criticisms must not be overestimated because no criticism is [word indistinct]. The majority of the people and the party are in favor of the reforms. We are therefore optimistic. We are optimistic. These criticisms are not a fight aginst the reforms, you know. It is part of the political game, you know. There are people who cannot and do not know how to be stay abreast with contemporary way of thinking, especially within the political and management machineries. Civil servants, engineers, intellectuals, farmers, [words indistinct], and the intellegentsia are all in favor of these reforms.

[Reporter] Mr Ambassador, we all know that perestroyka has enabled the employment of foreigners in Soviet enterprises. Mr Ambassador, have any concrete results been achieved from this kind of partnership?

[Shmanevskiy] To be frank with you, we are only at the beginning. But it is not only a question of the financial and economic participation of foreigners in our country but also the political participation in enterprises abroad. It is a policy of openness, you know?

[Reporter] This is my last question, Mr Ambassador. Is the USSR moving toward an open market... [changes thought] I shall rather say a capitalist economy?

[Shmanevskiy] It is a long term policy, if you wish. We are at the beginning. We shall continue to develop it. [end recording]

Soviet Leadership Greets Ethiopia on Anniversary

PM1909091989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR leadership bodies' greetings message to Ethiopian leaders]

[Text] To Comrade Mengistu Haile Mariam, general secretary of the Workers Party of Ethiopia [WPE] Central Committee and Ethiopian president

To Comrade Fikre-Selassie Wodgeress, member of the WPE Central Committee Politburo and Ethiopian prime minister

The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government send the WPE Central Committee, the Ethiopian Councils of State and Ministers, and the entire friendly Ethiopian people fraternal greetings and cordial congratulations on the 15th anniversary of the revolution.

During these years the Soviet Union has reaffirmed through words and actions its friendship and solidarity with the Ethiopian people struggling for socioeconomic and political transformations and the maintenance of the national unity and territorial integrity of their ancient country. The Soviet Union assessed as truly historic the creation of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, the adoption of its Constitution, and the formation of the supreme organ of people's power—the National Assembly (Shengo).

The Ethiopian National Assembly initiative to bring about a peaceful settlement in Eritrea has met with an extensive positive reaction worldwide. It has been seen as an act of state wisdom and a manifestation of great responsibility for Ethiopia's destiny. Its speedy implementation, the beginning of a dialogue around the negotiating table, and the finding of a democratic and just settlement to the Eritrea problem will allow the Ethiopian people to make fuller use of their vigor, power, and resources to resolve the tasks of national development.

The Soviet Union makes a high assessment of cooperation with Ethiopia in the international arena in the struggle to strengthen universal peace and security and for disarmament and the strengthening of confidence between states in the spirit of the principles of new political thinking. The Ethiopian leadership's efforts aimed at establishing stability and good-neighborliness in the Horn of Africa receive our unswerving support and all-around assistance.

We are sure that the close relations of friendship and multifaceted cooperation that traditionally exist between the USSR and Ethiopia will be improved and strengthened for the benefit of our countries' peoples and in the interests of peace and calm in Africa.

We wish you, dear comrades, the WPE Central Committee, the Ethiopian Councils of State and Ministers, and the friendly Ethiopian people successes in their

progress along the path mapped out by the revolution—the path of peace and prosperity.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee
USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

East Europe

Article Welcomes 'Finlandization' of East Europe

18120118 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 34, 27 Aug-3 Sep 89 p 6

[Article by Andranik Migranyan, senior scientific associate in the Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System: "For Discussion: An Epitaph to the Brezhnev Doctrine: The USSR and Other Socialist Countries in the Context of East-West Relations"]

[Text] **The processes taking place in the USSR and some socialist countries of Eastern Europe are now the focus of political analysts', as well as politicians', attention. But this attention is not confined to the sphere of internal processes. In connection with Moscow's new thinking in international relations and the idea of creating a common European home, the changing character of relations between the USSR and the other socialist countries of Eastern Europe assumes special importance. Being discussed with particular vigour in the West and in some Warsaw Treaty countries is the so-called "Brezhnev doctrine." Suppositions are made on the attitude towards this doctrine of the present Soviet leadership.**

The "Brezhnev doctrine" has never been officially formulated, and has never been recognized by Soviet political figures and experts in world affairs. However, after the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the troops of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries in 1968, an understanding of the nature of relations between the USSR and its socialist allies, different in form but similar in essence, took shape in the West and in our country. Underlying it was the principle of a single model of socialism. The totalitarian regime, which took shape by the 1930s and was somewhat moderated in the Khrushchev-Brezhnev period, presented itself as that model. Any deviations towards democratic socialism in any of the Warsaw Treaty countries provided the others, above all the USSR, with an opportunity to interfere in the domestic affairs of that country in order to restore the "genuine" appearance of socialism. What in the West was called the "Brezhnev doctrine" in our theoretical studies was dubbed the principle of socialist internationalism in relations between the Warsaw Treaty countries. According to this principle, the Party and state leadership of each socialist country is responsible not only to its Party and the people but also to the entire world system of socialism. This principle consolidated the conception of collective responsibility of all Warsaw Treaty member-countries for the destiny of socialism in each country.

Along the Road of Pluralism

Proceeding from the above-mentioned innovations in the foreign policy activity of the Soviet leadership, let's try and ascertain the changing nature of relations between the USSR and other socialist countries, understand their role in the global strategy of Soviet-U.S., of East-West relations. This, I believe, will help answer the question of the fate of the "Brezhnev doctrine" and of the present Soviet leadership's attitude towards it.

An analysis of the new thinking, I would say, gives us grounds for stating that the USSR, having started a radical renovation of the existing model of socialism, has ceased to regard it as the only correct one. It recognizes not only the lawfulness of the Western democratic model, but also the urgent necessity to transfer some of its essential components to its own country. No longer regarding ourselves as an alternative model of development for the whole world community, and having realized the fundamental weak points of our own economic and political system, we are deliberately trying not to hinder Western-style international economic contacts. On the contrary, we would like to integrate with that system and adapt ourselves to its already existing structures. Significant in this respect is the change in our attitude to the integration processes going on in Europe and in the West as a whole. Recent Soviet foreign policy gives us ground to outline the general road towards the single, transcontinental community.

I think a start has already been given to the process of transforming the established contacts between the USSR, the socialist countries and those in the Third World that are oriented towards the Soviet Union. The most appreciable practical steps towards the reorientation of Soviet foreign policy are being taken in respect to the Third World countries, especially in the conflict zones. The principled line in those regions, stemming from the USSR's general global strategy, is, I'd say, directed at refusing to set up new leftist totalitarian regimes. In practice it means rejecting competition with the West for the choice by these countries of their roads of development. There is a stronger tendency towards constructive cooperation with the West in overcoming the disastrous lag between the advanced industrial and the developing countries. The withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan and constructive cooperation with the West to solve problems in the conflict zones have already started producing results in South-East Asia and Africa.

A special place in this process of transformation is held by the socialist countries. The newly formulated global aims of the USSR have predetermined the reassessment of the role and the place of the socialist countries when developing the strategic foreign policy line of the Soviet Union. The new leadership realizes that the USSR must be interested in reconsidering relations within the community so as to enable the East European countries to

organically and painlessly join the Western world economic system. At the first stage of economic and political restructuring in the USSR and its gradual involvement in direct economic contacts with the West, acceptable both for the Soviet Union and the East European countries, as an intermediate phase, would be the new relations that in the West are oftentimes called the "Finlandization" of the European socialist states. In some countries this process is already underway, and we understand and accept this de facto.

What the Terms Mean

The term "Finlandization" in Western political science is understood to mean the following: the capitalist countries which want to have friendly relations with the USSR can achieve this on condition that they limit their sovereignty in international contacts (by always being aware of the USSR in every one of their foreign policy actions). In the opinion of Western analysts, such is the case in Soviet-Finnish relations. From their point of view, a "Finlandized" country is one which, not differing in social system from Western countries and being involved in Western world economic contacts, conducts its foreign policy with preferential consideration for Soviet military and political interests. Analyzing our strategic aims, Western political scientists are now trying to answer the question: will the USSR within the framework of the new thinking go so far as to permit the "Finlandization" of East European countries? "Finlandization" in those countries, as they understand it, will mean development along the lines of Finland: in the economic sphere—market relations, and in the political sphere—a pluralistic, multiparty model of democracy and closer involvement in the Western system of world economic contacts. It is also expected that these countries will remain in the sphere of Soviet influence, and will, like Finland, pursue a responsible foreign policy with account for the military and political interests of the USSR. The question of eliminating the Warsaw Treaty Organization is not put directly, but a conclusion is drawn that a reform of this alliance, in line with the new thinking, is a must.

The Western conceptions of "Finlandization" contain a number of interesting observations on the likely character of relations between the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty countries. However, to directly carry the nature of relations between the USSR and Finland over to relations between the socialist countries would hardly be justified. The latter have for many years been within the framework of the same military and economic organizations. Although it is perfectly clear that without deep-going internal changes in the economic and political spheres of the East European countries and without a correct understanding of this process in Moscow, the Soviet Union will not be able to achieve its own limited integration with the Western system of world economic contacts.

I would say that the process of transformation must include a number of very important components which would help carry out the internal modification of the economic and political system in the socialist countries and, on that basis, involve them more closely in the orbit of Western economic contacts. In exchange for its readiness not to hinder developments in that direction, the USSR must receive the necessary guarantees from the East European countries that in foreign policy they undertake to act responsibly regarding the USSR. This must not endanger Soviet interests in the transition period of the universal restructuring of East-West relations. The process of "Finlandization" clearly cannot take place in all the socialist countries simultaneously. Some of them, as for example Hungary and Poland, are more prepared and are effectively moving in that direction. Where Soviet foreign policy interests are not challenged, and an attempt is made to set up a market economy and a pluralistic system, the processes taking place in these countries can be correctly understood by the Soviet Union. Only along this road can more favourable conditions be created for a relatively painless integration of those countries with the rest of civilization. This process does not threaten Soviet interests. On the contrary, it will be able to obtain all the advantages now available in our relations with Finland (integration with Western markets, the achievements of Western science and technology). True, an objection may arise that such a development of events might lead to the estrangement of those countries from the USSR and their involvement in the orbit of Western economic and political interests. It seems to me that such apprehensions stem from the old imperial logic, in accordance with which the confrontation of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries must inevitably be preserved. According to the same logic, the relations of domination and submission within the socialist system must remain, too, and economic contacts and relations be subordinated to the interests of leaving the status quo unchanged.

Consideration for Western Positions

As is generally known, for the last decade the USA has been conducting a differentiated policy regarding East European countries, trying to tear them away from the sphere of Soviet influence and to enhance the establishment there of Western institutions and values. If such a policy was formerly pursued in the context of global Soviet-U.S., East-West confrontation, today it may acquire another content. In conditions of global confrontation, Soviet-U.S. opposition mainly manifested itself in the Third World and East European countries and, naturally, these zones were spheres where the global interests of both countries clashed. Within the new thinking and new global aims of the Soviet Union, when the USSR instead of confrontation and spreading its own model is carrying out internal modernization and is taking steps towards direct constructive cooperation and exchange of know-how in the economic, as well as the socio-cultural, spheres with the West, especially with the United States, the role and the place of these countries and regions radically changes in global Soviet-U.S. and East-West relations. After taking the initiative away

from the USA, as well as from the reformistically-minded forces in those countries (Poland, Hungary), the USSR may support their transformation. Such a policy will in practice confirm the seriousness of our global aims for entering into the world economic contacts. The changing nature of relations with the Warsaw Treaty states will create a more favourable image of the USSR among the public both in those countries and throughout the world. Such conduct by the USSR will induce the USA, too, to make serious corrections in its foreign policy regarding Eastern Europe. Much more important for the US will be a policy as regards the USSR that would contribute to the aims of perestroika inside the Soviet Union and would ensure the creation of a favourable atmosphere for the USSR in the world. Along that road the West will achieve much more towards a stable peace and the development of effective mechanisms to overcome the historical gap between the two systems than by trying to tear some socialist countries from the sphere of Soviet influence.

FRG, West Cast 'Shadow' on GDR 40th Anniversary

PM1509183989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 89 First Edition p 1, 4

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch under the rubric "A Correspondent Comments": "An Attempt To Undermine Stability"]

[Text] Berlin—Anyone who knows what a complex path the development of relations between the two German states has always followed might have expected that some kind of attempt would be made in the West in connection with the impending 40th anniversary of the GDR to cast a shadow on this festive occasion of its people. And, indeed, it did not pass without provocations against the GDR.

Two FRG television channels and one West Berlin television channel, which are received virtually throughout the territory of the GDR, launched a large-scale operation under the title "flight" as of mid-August. It was targeted at GDR citizens—hundreds of thousands of them—who were spending their holidays in other socialist countries.

In an effort to create a tense atmosphere, West German television and radio carried reports about people who, preferring to change their place of residence by illegal methods, had "installed themselves" in FRG embassies in other countries, and especially in Hungary. The campaign of incitement, overt appeals not to return to the GDR, and recruitment met with a response from some of the holidaymakers staying in that country. Compared with the overall number of GDR citizens spending their vacation in Hungary at the time, the proportion was insignificant. Nonetheless, question of several thousand people were involved, for whom special tent camps were set up.

The GDR made efforts to settle the problem by normal means. It declared that all these people were free to return to their permanent residences. They would not be persecuted and would be able to take up their former jobs. At the same time, the GDR reminded Hungary that they had signed an accord under which GDR citizens wanting to travel from Hungary to third countries needed the appropriate GDR documents.

Despite this, Hungary opened its border with Austria to enable GDR citizens wanting to illegally resettle in the FRG, to leave. Irrespective of the fact that these people did not suffer at home either from unemployment or poverty (according to Western television reports at least 1,500 cars crossed the border!) nor any form of political persecution, Western propaganda stubbornly insists on referring to these people as "refugees." Prior to the beginning of the operation, Western propaganda expressed the hypothesis that there would be some 20,000 "refugees," if not more. Then the estimate gradually fell to 15,000. While this article is being written, West German mass media are citing a figure somewhat in excess of 13,000. Attention is being drawn to the detail that the average age of the illegal resettlers is 27.

It is perfectly obvious that the large-scale provocative action that was launched against the GDR is an overt violation of international law. It took place under the motto proclaimed by the West German newspaper DIE WELT: "Germans Help Germans." These words clearly smack of chauvinism.

The events of the past few weeks have shown again that by means of its legislation the FRG has created for itself an instrument, at variance with international law, which it can use at any time to exacerbate the international situation. It consists of nonrecognition of GDR citizenship. This act is without precedent: Under the Treaty on the Fundamental Principles of Relations Between the GDR and the FRG both sides recognized each other's sovereignty and independence and the principle of non-interference in internal affairs. However, in the opinion of the FRG, recognition of the sovereign and independent state of the GDR does not mean that citizenship exists within the GDR. As far as the FRG is concerned, only "pan-German citizenship" exists, applying to all Germans who live on the territory of the German Reich within its 1937 borders." On this mythical basis the FRG has declared that it has "a duty to take care" of "all Germans." And so, in contravention of the norms of international law and through crude interference in the settlement of questions which are an internal matter of the GDR, the FRG has supplied GDR citizens at its embassy in Budapest with its own passports.

What lies in store for the people who have ended up in the FRG in this way? This is not an easy question. However, one frame in a West German television broadcast could not but attract attention: An employment office has opened in the refugee camp. The announcer, obviously in an effort to reassure his 2 million unemployed compatriots, hastened to explain that the settlers are being registered here so that they can... apply for unemployment benefit! A number of West German

newspapers are writing right now that the settlers will come up against hostility from those living around them who will perceive them as rivals in the labor market.

Well, these people have made their choice, and these are their new worries, which they did not have when they were living in the GDR.

In the throes of nationalist euphoria, many FRG mass media and even some politicians have clearly not given enough thought to what consequences all this might lead to. During the past few days one has repeatedly been reminded of a bull in a china shop. An attempt has been made to undermine the stability in relations between the two German states, a stability that they themselves need just like all the countries of the continent that received with approval the idea of a "common European home." It is obvious that in order to maintain this stability, strict observance of international law and of concluded treaties and agreements is necessary. No matter how much restraint, self-control, and statesmanship it will take, there is no escaping the efforts that it will take to restore the fragile "china" that has been broken during the past few weeks.

15th PZPR Central Committee Plenum Reported

PM1909132989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Polish United Workers Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Warsaw, 18 Sep—The 15th Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee Plenum opened in Warsaw today.

We are entering the period of preparation for the 11th PZPR Congress, Mieczyslaw Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, said as he opened the session.

L. Miller, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the PZPR, who delivered the report, noted that for the first time in the party's history a PZPR Central Committee Plenum is being held in a situation where the party not only does not have a majority in the Sejm but also has no majority in the government.

The speaker pointed to the need to do everything to strengthen the force of the party and its prestige, otherwise the PZPR may find itself on the back seat of the country's political life. He noted that the party's strength lies primarily in public support, in the constant desire to bring to the masses the essence of the PZPR's intentions and decisions.

The PZPR Central Committee Politburo suggests to the Central Committee that it hold a general party poll which would sum up the results of the discussion on the party's state and future and its degree of readiness for the congress.

PZPR Legal Expert Meets Chebrikov in Moscow

PM1909141789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p5

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A. Gdula, head of the Polish United Workers Party (PZPR) Central Committee Social and Legal Department, was in Moscow on 12-14 September at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

There was an exchange of opinions with the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee State and Law Department on the work forms and methods of law enforcement bodies' party organizations to strengthen legality and law and order.

A. Gdula also met the leadership, scientific personnel, and students of the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy.

On 14 September A. Gdula was received by V.M. Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. They discussed questions of mutual interest.

Commentators Discuss New Polish Government

LD1609210989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 16 Sep 89

["Saturday Dialogue: The World in the Mirror of Events" program, presented by All-Union Radio commentators Yevgeniy Grachev and Viktor Levin]

[Text] [Levin] Let's start with Poland. The formation of the new government is of fundamental significance; people not only in Poland itself but also far beyond are talking about an event of historic significance. There are, indeed, grounds for this: for the first time in the history of postwar Poland the leading role in the government has not gone to the communists.

[Grachev] You know, Viktor Nikolayevich, a correspondent from CBS Television described the formation of the new government in the following words: a historic peaceful transfer from a communist to a noncommunist administration has taken place.

[Levin] That's putting it trenchantly, but in my view not particularly accurately. In the first place, one should certainly not forget that the Polish United Workers' Party [PZPR] has been given four very important ministerial posts in the new government—the Ministers of National Defense, Internal Affairs, Foreign Economic Relations, and Transportation—in addition to the post of deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, though it is true that Comrade Kiszczak combines the offices of deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Internal Affairs.

[Grachev] Yes, indeed, these are very important posts.

[Levin] Key posts, to a certain degree, it could be said. In the second place, the way toward forming the government was initiated by the PZPR leadership, primarily by the current president of the Polish People's Republic, Wojciech Jaruzelski.

[Grachev] That is absolutely correct. It was the communists who initiated the roundtable which opened up the way for cooperation between all who aspire to bring Poland out of its grave crisis.

[Levin] During his speech in the Sejm, head of government Tadeusz Mazowiecki suddenly felt ill and he was obliged to interrupt his speech for 50 minutes. When Mazowiecki resumed his place at the tribune, he said his health could be compared in its frailty with the Polish economy.

[Grachev] Yes, the economic situation in Poland is indeed grave, and furthermore it proved very difficult to form the government. He seemed to have fewest problems with Solidarity, of which he is himself a member—that is quite understandable, of course—and with the Communists. During the negotations with the United Peasant's Party [zsl] however, things sometimes seemed to come to acute conflicts.

[Levin] First and foremost, there are conflicts within ZSL, itself. As you obviously know, comrade radio listeners, the upshot of this was that Malinowski, the chairman of the ZSL, was obliged to tender his resignation.

[Grachev] Let us, though, return, Viktor Nikolayevich, to the Polish Government. Solidarity has the largest number of ministerial posts in it. There was a long dispute over who should have the portfolio of Minister of Foreign Affairs, and they agreed on a professor of international law close to Catholic circles, but who is not a member of Solidarity—Skubiszewski.

[Levin] Let us say frankly that it is the foreign policy of the new government that is of prime concern to us. It is, of course, far from being a matter of indifference to us how Poland's relations with the Soviet Union will shape up in the future, and what role Poland plans to play in the Warsaw Pact Organization and CEMA. In his first interview, foreign minister Skubiszewski stressed that Poland will remain loyal to its obligations deriving from the Warsaw Pact; and as far as the CEMA is concerned, Poland has an interest in developing cooperation. And there are other authoritative statements on this point, too.

[Grachev] We should dwell a little on this question. You know, yesterday, in a selection of letters in IZVESTIYA in connection with an article in the paper marking the events of August 1968 in Czechoslovakia, I read a letter from a war and labor veteran, Krylov, from Voronezh, containing words such as this, for example: Previously, our country's leadership used to take measures—good or bad, but nevertheless decisive measures—to ensure that member countries of CEMA and the Warsaw Pact remained within the bounds of these alliances. Now, the author of the letter goes on, we appear to have no such concerns. Perestroyka is indeed necessary, he considers, but the leadership should not let the processes under way slip out of its control, and should if necessary, I think—Krylov writes—intervene.

[Levin] Well, if it were only he who thought so! But it is revealing that you have drawn attention to this letter, Yevgeniy Tikhonovich—I also noticed it, incidentally. Let's just think about this, comrades: Who gave the Soviet Union the right to intervene in the internal affairs of sovereign states? And who allotted us the role of a judge who can pass categorical sentence on reforms which sovereign states—I stress "sovereign"—consider it necessary to implement? Frankly speaking, I am far from accusing Comrade Krylov of anything at all. He is only repeating today what was said at the top, at the very top, not so very long ago.

[Grachev] That's true.

[Levin] We tried to reduce all to the same level. Yet the building of socialism is a creative matter, in which one needs to take account not only of the general patterns but also national features.

[Grachev] More than that, a distinctive feature of perestroyka is that the truth of it has been recognized, and today no one gets peturbed if, for example, our friends in the GDR speak about socialism in the national colors of the GDR.

[Levin] To return to Poland, though, people there speak more often about the transition from socialism to capitalism, although in my opinion, before clutching at one's heart and taking a sedative, one should stop and think exactly what lies behind these words. For very often, we failed to see the essence behind the loud words and slogans. It suffices to ask a simple question: Did socialism exist in Poland, meaning by socialism a society of free and equal people, a society of social justice and well-being? And one comes to the conclusion that if Poland does indeed proceed along another path, it is not away from socialism.

[Grachev] Well, and in any event, it is evidently in the interests of the Soviet Union for Poland to be a stable country, a prosperous country.

[Levin] Without doubt, Yevgeniy Tikhonovich, that is the very essence.

[Grachev] As for our foreign policy interests, which we have already touched upon, there is of course no doubt about our interest. This was, incidentally, stated every precisely in the USSR Council of Ministers' telegram to Tadeusz Mazowiecki, which was sent to him on the occasion of his appointment as chairman of the Council of Ministers. We express the conviction, the telegram states, that the traditional relations of friendship and all-round cooperation between the USSR and Poland, which have been distinguished by a high level of dynamism in recent years, will continue to develop on the basis of sovereign equality and respect, mutual benefit,

and mutual responsibility, in the interests of our peoples and in the interests of peace and stability in Europe and throughout the world.

[Levin] As far as I can judge, the Polish Government, too, adheres to these same principles; as for the fact that its composition is somewhat, shall we say, untraditional, well—there is a great deal in our life at present that is untraditional. And that's splendid, for ossified dogmas can only lead to an impasse. I would like to cite, too, the opinion of Orzechowski, chairman of the PZPR group of deputies in the Sejm. He stressed that the former parliamentary opposition has taken into its hands the decisive responsibility for the current administation of state affairs; in inviting the PZPR to take part in the government, it thereby opened up the way to forming a wide coalition government. A common government, Comrade Orzechowski said, means joint responsibility and cooperation between partners at all levels of administration.

Further Reportage on SFRY's Kadijevic Visit

Kadijevic Visits Naval Academy

LD1409222789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1442 GMT 14 Sep 89

[Text] Leningrad, 14 Sep (TASS)—Colonel General Veljko Kadijevic, federal secretary for national defense of Yugoslavia, visited the Soviet Marshal Grechko Naval Academy today. Veljko Kadijevic is on an official visit to the USSR at the invitation of Army General Dmitriy Yazov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of defense.

Colonel General Veljko Kadijevic visited the classrooms and laboratories, became acquiainted with the operational-tactical technical center, and spoke with the teachers.

This most ancient Russian naval academy has a history going back to the higher officers' classes created in 1827 under the naval cadet corps. The famous Russian admirals Nakhimov and Ushakov and the commanders of contemporary atomic submarines studied here.

"We are convinced that the organization of the teaching process, and the electronic and technical equipment of the academy corresponds to the most contemporary needs for the training of naval commanders," noted the guest. "We are also appreciative of the assistance to the SFRY Navy. The Yugoslav officers who are graduates of the Leningrad academy are serving excellently. They possess great knowledge and an ability to find their bearings quickly in a tactical situation. Many of them occupy responsible posts. I hope our cooperation will continue."

Colonel General Kadijevic also placed a wreath at the Piskarevskiy memorial cemetery today. About 500,000 Leningraders and defenders of the city, who perished in the 900-day blockage of the city during World War II, are buried there.

The guest from Yugoslavia reviewed the collection of the state hermitage, one of the world's best museums, and visited the Petrodvorets suburb of Leningrad, one famous for its 18th century palace and park.

Army General Valdimir Arkhipov, deputy USSR defense minister, is accompanying the SFRY federal secretary for national defense on his trip around the country.

Kadijevic Leaves on Tour of USSR

PM1509114189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Trip Around Country"]

[Text] Colonel General V. Kadijevic, SFRY federal secretary for national defense, who is paying an official visit to our country, visited the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy 13 September. He was familiarized with the educational and material base and the organization of the educational process. Colonel General V. Kadijevic was accompanied by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister.

On the same day the guest from Yugoslavia had an excursion around the Moscow Kremlin.

In the afternoon Colonel General V. Kadijevic left Moscow on a trip around the country.

The guest and his escort were seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by Army General D.T. Yazov; Army General M.A. Moiseyev; Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, USSR deputy defense minister; and other officials.

The send-off party included M. Veres, SFRY ambassador to the USSR.

The SFRY and USSR state flags were raised at the airport, an honor guard was formed on the airfield, and the two countries' national anthems were played.

On the same day Colonel General V. Kadijevic arrived in Leningrad. He was met at the airport by Colonel General V.F. Yermakov, commander of the troops of the Leningrad Military District, and other officials.

En route from the airport the guest laid flowers at the monument to the heroic defenders of the city on Victory Square.

Defense Secretary Visits Sevastopol

LD1609134689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 16 Sep 89

[Text] Sevastopol, 16 Sep (TASS)—SFRY Federal Defense Secretary Colonel General Veljko Kadijevic today visited the hero city of Sevastopol. He is in the

Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of Army General Dmitriy Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

The Yugoslav visitor toured the missile cruiser Slava and was shown around the sights of the town.

Yazov Accompanies Kadijevic

PM2009083389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 First Edition p 1

[Correspondent Captain 2d Rank V. Pasyakin report under the general heading: "Visit Over"]

[Text] Sevastopol, 16 Sep—Colonel General V. Kadijevic, SFRY federal secretary for national defense, on an official visit to the Soviet Union, arrived in Sevastopol. He viewed the diorama "The Storming of Mount Sapun 7 May 1944," the panorama "The Defense of Sevastopol 1854-1855," and the missile cruiser "Slava."

Col Gen V. Kadijevic was accompanied by Army General D.T. Yazov and Admiral M.N. Khronopulo, commander of the Black Sea Fleet.

Col Gen V. Kadijevic left for home the same day. The Yugoslav guest was seen off at the airport by Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense.

Yugoslav Peasants' Rally for Reform Noted

PM1409142589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Ye. Vostrukhov dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "We follow the Event. Ultimatum Even Given to the Federal Assembly"]

[Text] Belgrade—In the afternoon motor transport in downtown Belgrade had to stop: Thousands of peasants from various regions of Yugoslavia filled the spacious square in front of the SFRY Federal Assembly. They had gathered for a rally to protest the difficult situation in the country's agriculture. The date of this rally was announced earlier, but right until the last day it was not clear: Would representatives from the villages go to the capital...

As IZVESTIYA has already reported (Nos 230 and 231), soon after the end of the grain harvest the initiative of peasants from Vojvodina to hold a rally in Belgrade to protest about the government's lack of attention to the needs of agricultural complex was supported by field and farmstead workers in many other regions. The government met the ultimatum it was given by publishing its agrarian program, prepared for ratification at the upcoming Federal Assembly session. The program includes both immediate and long-term measures. It has respected most of the peasants' demands, but nevertheless, it has not eliminated their dissatisfaction. Why is this?

The preparatory committee had held an almost uninterrupted session over the past few days and nights in the Vojvodina village of Gordinovac. The question was being decided: To go to the capital or not? The point was that the federal authorities had often promised to start carrying out reforms in agriculture and to help the private sector and give it the same rights as the public sector. These promises were not kept. So it is not surprising that many people became suspicious about the reliability of the intentions of Ante Markovic's cabinet. In addition, some of the promised measures needed to be implemented immediately—for example, the introduction of new purchase prices for produce—since harvest time for corn, sunflowers, rice, and other crops is already approaching. And now it turns out that ratification of the government plan is indeed being delayed: The Federal Assembly deputies are on leave, and it will be the beginning of October before they take a decision.

A delegation which included representatives of the preparatory committee and Vojvodina social organizations left for talks in the capital. Slobodan Gligorijevic, chairman of the SFRY Federal Assembly, talked to the delegates...

The peasants' energetic protests about their disastrous situation and the ultimatum they had given to the government, brought the Yugoslav public's attention to agrarian problems. The mass media are analyzing the current situation in agriculture and stressing that radical change has long been necessary in the countryside.

The newspaper NIN considers that problems affecting agriculture cannot be resolved without reforming the country's political system and without a new approach to different types of ownership. Particular attention should be paid to private peasant farms, which make up over 80 percent of the country's arable land. But in comparison with the public sector collectives, they have restricted rights. Work in the fields and farms is undermechanized, and young people are leaving the villages. Around 7.5 million peasants have left the countryside in the postwar years. Hundreds of thousands of hectares of once fertile land have fallen into neglect. And even the substantial yearly capital investments in agriculture are not producing the necessary effect. A country that, according to experts' calculations, can feed 80 million people, is today forced to import some of its food products. "Give us the resources spent on them," the peasants are demanding. "We will buy fodder and machines and Yugoslavia will start to export produce."

At the talks in the capital, delegates from Vojvodina demanded an urgent session of the country's parliament and speedy ra' ication of the measures proposed by the government, and also a special program against inflation, which affects every peasant. As the question of an extraordinary session was left open, the preparatory committee raised the cry: "Everyone to the rally!"

"We will not leave Belgrade until the Federal Executive Council and the SFRY Federal Assembly meet our

demands," committee chairman Sava Gavorcic said on television on the eve of the rally. "The rally will go on as long as necessary, maybe even several days."

The rally went on for 5 and ½ hours. These are some of its slogans, which I wrote down in a notepad: "We no longer believe in promises made by functionaries!", "We are for our children's future!", and "Make us equal to the public sector and free us from excessive taxes!". Dozens of peasants went up on to the platform, and everyone spoke frankly about what pained them. Thousands of people waited in the pouring rain for the authorities' answer.

Late in the evening Stevo Mirjanic, federal secretary for agriculture, came to the microphone. In the name of the government he ratified the decision to adopt radical measures to improve the situation in the agricultural complex, stressing particularly: From now on the private sector will have the same rights as the public sector... After subsequent talks with the chairman of the Federal Assembly and other officials, the peasants decided to conclude the rally. And wait for the session of the Federal Assembly.

Ryzhkov Sends Greetings Message to Zagreb Fair

LD1809210989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1518 GMT 18 Sep 89

["Yugoslavia—Zagreb Fair"—TASS headline]

[Text] Zagreb, 18 Sep (TASS)—During the festive ceremony of opening the fair, a message of greetings was read out from N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. It notes that the USSR's participation in this major review of achievements in the field of production, technology and technological processes is seen as a good opportunity practically to facilitate a harmonious development of the international economic and scientific-technical cooperation. The USSR and the SFRY have wide prospects for interaction to unite both countries' efforts in the interests of bettering people's lives, says the message of greetings.

1968 CSSR Intervention Aided 'Conservatives'

18120119 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 34, 27 Aug-3 Sep 89 p 7

[Article by Yuriy Levada: "A Reactive Recoil: Rethinking the Prague Spring"]

[Text] What happened before dawn on August 21, 1968 is aligned in our memory not only with subsequent events in Czechoslovakia.

I suppose it is the task of the Czechoslovak historians to determine which forces in their country strengthened, and which weakened the hand of the Soviet leadership, and who and what are responsible for which interpretation. I think glasnost will eventually expose the entire mechanism of adopting relevant decisions: who reported what, who vacillated, which alternatives were considered and where, etc. Many of this history's "hotel servants" are coming out into the light of day and this has proved very instructive.

The other current of events relates to our own past, which we're having such difficulty overcoming. A wave of political frosts engulfed our country after the spring of 1968, but especially after August. "There was progress in Europe, but we were beaten for it," Alexander Hertzen wrote about 1848, words which also evoke the "post-August" period. Ideological pogroms were conducted, one after another, among historians, economists, journalists, sociologists, philosophers and men-of-letters. Dissent—even in its most moderate forms, even the defence of one's own positions in science—was considered a danger to the state. The "dissidents," i.e., the people who dared "to have a judgment of their own," were depicted as the chief enemies of the bulwarks. Compassion for the victims of arbitrariness was declared a crime (some people lost jobs and the right to be printed, others had to emigrate) and "signatories," i.e., the people who signed collective protests against unfair court decisions, were persecuted. In the fall of 1969, the Union of Soviet Writers shamed itself by expelling Alexander Solzhenitsyn. The principle of the camp escort, which he had described—"a step to the left or a step to the right was regarded as an escape"—once again became the basis of our official ideological life.

The disbanding of **Novy Mir**, led by Tvardovsky, and the disbanding of many research and artistic collectives was a function of this principle.

All right, then, was there a connection between the two currents of events? I think there was and a very direct one. At that time, noisy exposers made careers and found fame by finding "apostates" in all fields. At that time, Vladimir Yagodkin was a most furious ideological pogrom-maker in Moscow (Brezhnev called him "our eagle"), and his favourite words were "ideological discipline." Just imagine what an expression—not convictions but discipline.

After Khrushchev was removed in October 1964, two trends emerged: one to carry on the reforms (the 20th Congress line) without any "voluntarist niceties" and the other to return the country and the Party to their "usual road," that of Stalinist traditions. The strength was unequal: though the first line was proclaimed, the second one grew stronger all the time. The pressure brought to bear by the military under Brezhnev was a factor. A fatal choice was made in 1968 in favour of the repressive-conservative scenario. Those people and forces who felt offended by the 20th Congress and thirsted for revenge were now free to combat attempts to "deviate from the line" and to "revise" the model of the "best of the worlds" that had been established. There is no progress where any original word or thought is declared criminal. The choice made in 1968 signified the taking of the road to a blind alley, to the morass of stagnation.

"We didn't want to, but we had no other way out!" Brezhnev's words became the formula for an entire generation. "We didn't want to, but were forced to!" This was the stock phrase when something was being forbidden, closed down when people were seized, expelled or pressed. I can believe that they "didn't want to," or at least, "didn't want to very much." The time, when people could gloat over repressions was over—now one had only to keep the "peace" and one's honourable posts.

And it wasn't so much direct violence (even though it also was used) as the stifling, slowly-moving pressing that was killing reason and will. When friends and colleagues tried to persuade someone, hiding their eyes in the process, to have pity on them and "not to stick out"—the fear that this was all irreparable set in and pushed some into the mass desperation, and others—abroad.

Was there really no other way out? There is always an alternative, but people don't often decide to see it. Another way out was what today we call perestroika—the search for new forms of life and thought. The conservative leadership and the stagnant apparatus of the late 60s wasn't able to do this and, therefore, announced the road of pressure and prohibition as the "only" way.

It always seemed to me that those who furiously insisted on one line of thought, acted mostly out of fear than out of conscience: they knew that they were lying, that they were saving not the idea, but their posts and privileges. They curbed the criticism of Stalinism, but could not restore Stalinism itself, no matter how they tried. The one line of thought meant that only one person had the right to think, but he was gone—there was only dancing around an empty throne. There was neither total fear anymore, nor mass idolatry—the indispensable bulwarks of this throne—and without these it was of no use at all.

In our history, I don't think there was ever such a period of the triumph of overt hypocrisy. And when hypocrisy rules supreme, it is corruption that pays for it.

Decolonization took place in the 60s. It was a difficult transfer to equal interstate relations in various parts of the world. This also brought quite a few benefits to the former monopolies. And we had to don the thankless burden of Big Brother who kept order in the "family" (this originally patriarchal "family" model of international relations is very damaging in our inter-Union affairs, too). At the time, the ideology of Big Brother was quite popular due to propaganda, on the one hand, and "great-power" traditions, on the other. Arguments of the "we've liberated them, and they" type were still operating.

I think that we can draw two conclusions from the August choice and the frosts that came after it. Foreign policy—especially of major dimension—cannot but have a reactive recoil domestically. It can be diversified—political, economic, psychological or moral.

The action, taken on August 21, 1968, crushed the hopes for a gradual, evolutionary transformation of our own society. The most conservative forces consolidated and prevented any change in its political and economic patterns. To overcome the sluggishness of a system it is necessary to work to break it down. The same events put an end to any possibility of giving a "human face" to this social system, which was so alienated from man, called real socialism. Much deeper changes are needed within the system itself.

It is worth thinking over these lessons today.

CPCZ Audit Commission Visits, Holds Talks

PM1909143789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCZ) Central Control and Audit Commission led by its chairman, J. Hajn, was in the Soviet Union 10-14 September.

During friendly conversations with B.K. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, and A.A. Nizovtseva, deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, the sides exchanged experience of work by the two parties' control and auditing bodies and discussed the possibilities of further broadening their cooperation.

CSSR Submits Proposal for Normal Ties to Albania

PM1409150389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Normalizing Relations"]

[Text] Prague, 10 Sep—The CSSR Government has submitted a proposal to the Albanian Government on the full normalization of relations between the two states on the basis of the observance of the principles of equal rights, sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs, and of the upgrading of mutual diplomatic missions to the level of ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary. This was pointed out in a Czechoslovak Government statement.

I.P. Aboimov Receives Romanian Envoy Bucur

PM1109131589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Sep 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 31 August USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.P. Aboimov received I. Bucur, Romanian ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request.

Ryzhkov Condolences on Romanian Ship Sinking

PM1509152589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[Ryzhkov condolences to Romania's Dascalescu on Danube ship disaster]

[Text] To Comrade C. Dascalescu, Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania

I express my sincere sympathies in connection with the loss of the Romanian passenger ship on the Danube River, which resulted in human casualties.

I ask you to convey our condolences to the friends and relatives of those who died.

[Signed] N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

West Europe

Thatcher's 23 Sep Moscow Stopover Previewed

LD1909212489 Moscow World Service in English 1900 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] The British Prime Minister Mrs Thatcher is to make a brief stopover in Moscow on Saturday on her way home from Japan. She'll be having a meeting with President Gorbachev. Yevgeniy Ivanov looks ahead to their talks, and this is what he writes:

The interest that the public shows in the forthcoming meeting is not so difficult to explain. The British prime minister acted on many occasions as mediator in contacts between Moscow and Washington, thus giving additional impetus to the process of perestroyka in world relations. No matter what outcome the brief talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher will have, one truth remains indisputable: there is a need to fill East-West relations with a new content since at the given moment, and a rather prolonged moment at that, they are living off what has been gained. The British prime minister knows this very well, of course.

The Western media are literally crammed with discourses on the subject of how the Bush Administration displays its shyness in relation to the Soviet Union's initiatives in the field of disarmament in the first place, yet the attitude to the Soviet initiatives that the Washington administration demonstrates makes us recall that the word shyness has another shade of meaning to it—fearfulness. It looks as if Washington is fearful a bit in helping the Soviet Union advance further on the road of disarmament. One can expect that this, too, will be discussed by the Soviet and the British leaders during their meeting.

There is much talk in the West today as to how to help the Soviet Union carry through its policy of perestroyka. Anxiety is being voiced over its future. Now, this anxiety is quite understandable; it, too, will obviously become a subject of discussion during the current brief stopover of Mrs Thatcher in Moscow. Actually this concern about the country that has long been considered a source of danger to the West is prompted by the awareness that we are all in the same boat. The (?confidently) growing degree of this awareness is an indicator proving the vitality and reality of the concept of a new political thinking.

We are all hoping that the discussions between Mrs Thatcher and President Gorbachev and also Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's meetings on the same days with President Bush and Secretary of State Baker will clear up the situation for the future with a prospect to a general easing of military tension and to the strengthening of overall security at the same time.

Ambassador to Bonn Expected To Return to Moscow

AU2009100889 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 18 Sep 89 p 12

[Unattributed report: "Return to Moscow?"]

[Text] Yuliy Kvitsinsky, Soviet ambassador to Bonn, is soon supposed to deal with the FRG from Moscow. Bonn expects that after a CPSU Central Committee session this week, Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will make the expert on Germany and former negotiator at the disarmament talks his first deputy. Kvitsinsky, 52, is to become the successor of 66-year-old Anatoliy Kovalev, who is counted among the old guard of Shevardnadze's recently deceased predecessor Andrey Gromyko. Career diplomat Kvitsinsky, who played a substantial role in the conclusion of the Quadripartite Agreement in Berlin, would then be responsible for the Kremlin's European policy. The multilingual Russian was noticed by his interlocutors in Bonn as a follower of Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms, who sometimes was not afraid of being outspoken in talking about his supreme boss: Sometimes Gorbachev is in "too much of a hurry," he said.

Genscher on Prospects for Acheiving Arms Accords

PM1909115589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Favorable Prospects"]

[Text] Bonn, 18 Sep—FRG Foreign Minister H.D. Genscher has indicated the favorable prospects for achieving accords between West and East on arms reduction. "I believe," he said in an interview with the West Berlin RIAS radio station, "that in 1990 we shall be able to reach a specific result in the disarmament sphere... I say this with confidence, since I am sure that it is not only we but also the East who want this." After the elimination of intermediate-range missiles we can take a substantial new step in the disarmament field, he added.

Dwelling on the problems of banning chemical weapons, H.D. Genscher said that the FRG will support any accord between the USSR and the United States on this issue.

CPSU, FRG Greens Hold Seminar in Moscow

PM1909130989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Seminar Has Opened"]

[Text] In accordance with the program agreed on between the CPSU and the FRG "Green" Party for cooperation, including through public and scientific channels, a bilateral seminar on nuclear energy problems began in Moscow 18 September. The meeting was organized on the Soviet side by the Committee for European Security and Cooperation and a number of scientific and ecological organizations. The FRG includes, in addition to representatives of the "Green" Party, scientists and representatives of the antinuclear movement.

The seminar was opened by Academician I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee. Jutta Ditfurth, representative of the leadership of the "Greens" delegation, delivered a reply speech.

The Soviet and West German scientists and experts submitted a number of reports and statements which gave rise to lively discussion.

Political & Social

Text of Gorbachev's Plenum Report on Nationalities

PM2009102389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Second Edition, pp 2, 3

["On the Party's Nationalities Policy Under Present-Day Conditions. Report by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 19 September 1989 CPSU Central Committee Plenum"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Comrades, the logic of perestroyka and our daily experience have led us to conclude that the need for comprehensive profound changes is long overdue in ethnic relations.

Let us be frank: We did not arrive at the understanding of the need for such changes immediately after April 1985. This obviously was due to the widespread belief that things were more or less satisfactory in this sphere of social development.

Of course, we knew about the existence of difficult nationality problems. They were mentioned at the 27th Party Congress. But the entire scope of overdue change in this sphere revealed itself later, which advanced these issues to the focus of attention at the 19th party conference.

The current situation in interethnic relations cannot be assessed in any other way than as extremely complex. Unresolved issues have surfaced one after another, errors and deformations that were accumulated over decades have now made themselves felt, and dormant ethnic conflicts erupted.

Socio-economic and state-legal, ecological and demographic problems, problems of the development of language and culture and the preservation of national traditions have become closely intertwined. Each of them calls for immense attention, each is associated with human beings and with the destinies of whole nations.

We are facing the task of discussing from comprehensive and principled positions the current state of ethnic relations in the country and working out an up-to-date strategy of the party on the nationality issue by relying on Leninist principles, realities and prevalent trends in the world public movement.

Discussions on this issue in the party and society have long been under way. A great deal of analytical work has already been done.

All this has resulted in the party's draft platform published for nationwide discussion and submitted for consideration to the central committee's plenum today.

The text of the draft and suggestions that have been submitted are well known to you. That is why I will dwell only on some key issues.

I.

The nationality issue and, above all, the issue of the **correlation between international and national** in our party had to be handled even back when the revolution was being prepared and especially when building socialist society.

In full accordance with Marxist teaching, the party has upheld the internationalist stance since the very beginning.

As understood by Lenin, internationalism includes unfailing regard for ethnic interests, respect for the identity of each ethnic group, the recognition of all people as being equal, and an irreconcilable attitude to any forms of national oppression.

These goals can and should be reached by the joint efforts of working people of all nationalities. These are the Leninist dialectics of the international and the national.

Following the October Revolution the party was confronted with the need to find specific ways and forms of realising its nationality policy.

The Soviet system of government inherited a grave legacy from tsarism: The country was torn apart by interethnic contradictions and people inhabiting it were at different economic and cultural development levels, apart from being without rights.

In those conditions the problem of a state arrangement acquired vital significance. Many then advocated autonomisation or even a unitary state.

All the greater credit then goes to Lenin who was able to correctly catch the mood of the masses and the pressing needs of societal development and work out an optimum party strategy on the national issue.

This is how the idea of a state federation of a historically new type emerged to become one of the principal motive forces behind the dynamic progress of the entire country and of each ethnic group in it.

The impulse provided by the creation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics determined the main avenue for the development of our multinational society, although Stalin and his entourage were later still able, without directly encroaching on the federal form of statehood, to translate their idea of autonomisation into reality.

Deformities in interethnic relations, the baneful effects of excessive centralisation and bureaucratic administration, and injustices done to a number of people have recently come under extensive and harsh criticism.

The critique has been justified. More than that, it has been essential. There must be not a single "blank spot" left in the Soviet state's history. Society should have full and exhaustive information about all its episodes, no matter how bitter.

But while continuing and even deepening the analysis and criticism of the distortions of Lenin's nationality policy, we should not allow some untruths or semi-truths to be replaced by others.

We should view the history of how the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—a unique phenomenon in human history—came into being and developed from a strictly objective standpoint.

Attempts to idealize the past and present in rosy colors alone are futile and unacceptable. This, as we have seen, does not serve the interests of the working people, the cause of socialism. But it would be equally wrong to approach the past from nihilist positions—not only because it represents the experience of the struggle of many generations for a new society, for new relationships among people, but because it gives us the right to speak of huge historical achievements.

In spite of the deformations and errors that have occurred we must see the crux of the Soviet states development. We have no right to forget that we are evaluating the life and destiny, thoughts and deeds of those who have built up this state, who bore the brunt of the efforts to overcome the country's economic backwardness, who defended our homeland shoulder to shoulder during the Great Patriotic War, who raised it from ruins in the post-war years.

We have all grown up in a social atmosphere literally permeated with internationalism. Friendship of the people was not an abstract slogan for us, but an everyday reality. Can we forget about it? Can we renounce the internationalist legacy of our revolution?

We must not allow the difficulties and problems that overwhelm us today to eclipse the fundamental values, created during the years of Soviet power, on which our multinational country now rests. I shall put it in the following way: Any attempts to distort and belittle the true achievements in the sphere of national relations is an outrage against the memory of several generations of Soviet people. These attempts hold no water when compared to the actual facts of our life.

If somebody today claims that in terms of national development and inter-ethnic relationships the Soviet power has not wrought essential changes as compared to the situation in pre-revolutionary Russia, he is engaged in dishonest distortion of reality intended to whip up nationalistic passions and to motivate various extremist demands.

Carried away by nationalism, some people go to such lengths as to claim that internationalism and friendship of the people are meaningless propagandistic slogans, myths that do not reflect the actual state of affairs. But this holds no water.

The life of our society is constantly marked by manifestations of fraternal assistance, cooperation, concern and care for each other's affairs. Nevertheless, as I have already said, today we are confronted with serious conflicts and problems that have accumulated in inter-ethnic relations.

What the CPSU nationality policy and the development of the Soviet federation have brought to our people is a question of fundamental significance. Let us consider the issue in its three main dimensions: political, economic and intellectual.

That the people of Russia acquired various forms of national statehood is one of the most important **political** results of the socialist revolution and subsequent socialist transformations.

Comrades, it is worth recalling that tsarist Russia did not have the Ukraine, Belorussia, or Georgia, but only provinces of the Russian empire. Their people were not regarded as whole nations but only as the subjects of "his majesty the emperor." The same is true of other people of the Transcaucasia, the people of the Baltic region and Moldavia. In Central Asia the situation was even worse, as the remnants of feudal theocratic despotism formed the basis of the administrative set-up.

After the revolution complex processes involving the consolidation of the nation, the formation of their socialist statehood and, at the same time, the development of interaction and the membership in the federation intertwined. The year 1922, when a treaty on the formation of the USSR was concluded, and 1924, when the first constitution was passed, became landmarks in this respect.

In 1940 the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic was formed in the USSR. In the same year the USSR was joined by Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. This took place in a complex historical period when the Second World War had broken out and fascism was capturing one country after another. The people of the Baltic region also faced the real threat of enslavement.

Large-scale discussions are currently being held on events during that period. Much has yet to be analysed and evaluated. But there are no grounds to question the decision by the Baltic republics to join the USSR and the choice made by their people.

It is also clear that the Soviet leadership, taking a variety of measures to strenghen the country's security in the face of the Nazi threat, committed gross violations of the Leninist principles of foreign policy which rejects division into spheres of influence. We resolutely condemn this.

Generally speaking, comrades, we are for fully restoring historical truth. History cannot be rewritten in order to suit subjective views and political calculations, or giving in to the passions and ambitions of the present. The course of events cannot be reversed. One can go forward, only relying on historical truth and the reality of the modern world.

As a result of historical, even if contradictory, developments: A single federal socialist state took shape, inhabited by more than 100 ethnic groups.

It has a complex structure, with union and autonomous republics and autonomous regions and districts and with corresponding bodies of representative power and administration and other political and social institutions providing the people with possibilities to share in the process of historical creativity.

But the functioning of this system and consequently the fulfillment of the diverse interests of the people inhabiting our country was enormously damaged by unitarism and administer-by-command methods of management, which circumscribed the rights of republics and other national entities emasculated the real substance of the federation and held back the progress of our entire society.

I must also mention injustices and lawless acts against some ethnic groups in the past, especially during and immediately after the war.

Although political decisions have already been taken and assessments of principle made on this score, it should be said again today, once we are dealing with nationality policy, that the outrages against ethnic groups and their banishment from their native parts during the Great Patriotic War (World War II) must be resolutely condemned.

We should do everything to restore the flouted rights of the Soviet Germans, Crimean Tatars, Meskhetian Turks, Kalmyks, Balkars, Karkachays, Chechens, Ingushes, Greeks, Koreans and Kurds.

The issue is not simple and it is also painful in many respects. But regardless of the difficulties involved, we have only one way out, that of painstakingly searching for solutions that will be acceptable to all and take account of existing realities.

Now let's discuss the **economic side of the matter**.

As a result of the policy of expediting the progress of former ethnic outlying areas, all union republics during the years of Soviet government were able to create multibranch industries of their own and their social and economic development levels were evened out.

Whereas in 1926 the maximum industrial production per capita of old industrial regions exceeded that of the ethnic outskirts by 38 times, in 1941 the ratio shrank to 4.1 times and now stands at only 2.3 times.

While way back in the late 1950s workers outnumbered other social groups only in the Russian federation, Estonia and Latvia, in the end of the 1970s this was true of practically every republic.

Whereas before the war many ethnic groups did not have qualified personnel of their own, now the situation has changed dramatically and all of them have such personnel, including specialists of the highest qualification.

During the first decades of Soviet government, there could be no question of equivalent economic exchanges between different republics. The economically more developed regions, primarily the Russian Federation and the Ukraine, bore the brunt of efforts to "even out" development levels in the country.

But it was not always the European part of the country that gave material and technical aid to the Asian part.

Suffice it to recall post-war economic rehabilitation. The entire federation then contributed to overcoming dislocation in the war-ravaged regions of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia and Moldavia, and assisting industry and agriculture in the Baltic republics to find their feet.

To put it in a nutshell, great wealth has been created over the years of Soviet power by the pooled efforts of all our people. Each ethnic group is entitled to see it as incorporating its work as well, to view it as also belonging to it, as being common property.

As a result of many years of developing on the basis of plans, the Soviet economy has become highly integrated and is now a single national economic complex.

I have in mind not merely the sum total of production capacities, but the single economic organism, separate parts of which cannot exist without the already formed and deepening relationships within the national economy as a whole.

In noting these achievements, I am far from claiming that we have reached the limit in ensuring the harmonic interaction of all elements of our national economy. Unfortunately, we lag behind here in many ways, and further deepening of labor cooperation is an important reserve in our development. But even then the attained density of economic interaction revolts, literally speaking, against any attempts to disrupt it. We must all realize this in full measure so as not to make mistakes in the decisions we make and will go on making in the course of perestroyka.

I wish to furnish some figures characterising interrepublican relationships through the balance of intersectoral exchanges. In 1987 the share of industrial production imported by the republics from other parts of the country amounted to 18 percent in the Russian Federation, 26 percent in the Ukraine, 39 percent in Belorussia, 33 percent in Kazakhstan, 33-40 percent in the Transcaucasian republics, 39-42 percent in the Baltic republics, 37-47 percent in Central Asia, 44 percent in Moldavia.

Russia's powerful oil and gas complex ensures most of the power requirements in all the republics. The Russian Federation, the Ukraine and Kazakhstan supply all the country with metal and account for 90 percent of grain production. Central Asia, apart from many other goods, supplies cotton. Belorussia, Lithunania, Latvia and

Estonia manufacture precision machinery and goods of the light industry, and are major suppliers of meat, milk and potatoes. The Transcaucasian republics and Moldavia also have a similar economic profile. Analysis shows that practically no republic could build up by itself the potential it now possesses. Not one of them could ensure the latter's normal operation and effective use. Such are the results achieved by polling the efforts of people.

The actual reality is that the Latvian Republic, for instance, satisfies 96 percent of its requirements in fuel, 50 percent of its requirements in power, 90 percent of its requirements in ferrous metals, 100 percent of its requirements in non-ferrous metals, 80 percent of its requirements in raw chemical materials and 63 percent of the machine-building production it needs by importing them from other parts of the country.

About 1.5 million tonnes of grain are annually brought from other parts of the country for the needs of the republic's livestock—more than a half of the concentrated fodder used there.

The picture is similar in other republics. Armenia, let us say, imports from other parts of the country 100 percent of all consumed fuel, 93 percent of its ferrous metal, 56 percent of its chemical and petrochemical goods, 32 percent of its machine-building and metal-working production, 37 percent of meat and more than 64 percent of the dairy products it consumes. The Uzbek Republic satisfies in this way 50 percent of its requirements in petroleum and gas industry products, 56 percent of its requirement in coal, 80 percent in ferrous metallurgy products and 48 percent in non-ferrous metallurgy goods.

One of the most important prerequisites for the normal functioning of any economy is the existence of a developed market. We know how acute now is competitive struggle in the world market. A major advantage of all our republics and regions is without doubt the existence of a practically unlimited all-union market.

Here is an example: Lithuania supplies other republics with computer, television and sound-recording equipment, machine-tools, products of electrical engineering, the light and food industries, and takes delivery of technological equipment, cars, tractors, combine-harvesters and oil products from the Russian Federation, metal and coal from the Ukraine, potash fertiliser from Belorussia, cotton from Central Asia, non-ferrous metals and wool from Kazakhstan, and fruits from Moldavia and Transcaucasia.

The understanding and conclusions based on the analysis of the established economic realities are of fundamental significance for elaborating an up-to-date nationality policy.

It goes without saying that one should not ignore the negative processes that have emerged as a consequence of the irrational allocation of productive forces and have led to outbreaks of ecological and demographic problems.

Some regions suffer labor shortages, and existing plant is not fully used, which inflicts heavy economic losses.

Other regions, primarily the republics of Central Asia and to some extent Transcaucasia and Moldavia have excessive manpower resources.

This is turning out to be one of the sources of social tension and the flare-up of conflict situations, including in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations. There has been more than ample evidence of that lately.

The causes of the existing situation must be adequately studied. All these questions should be thoroughly analysed within the framework of the continuing work on the concept of economic restructuring.

There are proposals from Uzbekistan. Other republics are also drafting them.

This work should be continued so that the first drastic steps towards improving the situation can be made in the 13th five-year period.

This is what I would like to tell you, comrades, in this connection. We now speak, and this is quite right, about the baneful effect of excessive centralization, diktat and arbitrariness of departments in the development of various economic branches.

But I could show you today a volume summarising requests that arrived from the union republics in the past ten years for the construction of new enterprises and the establishment of new industries.

Much for what the center is now being blamed emerged as a result of persistent, repeated requests from republican and local bodies.

Look at verbatim reports of the USSR Supreme Soviet's sessions and you will see they are full of unending requests of this kind. And how many memorandums have been sent to the party Central Committee.

In a bid to secure one or another prestigious project, local authorities often agreed to the harshest of conditions demanded by central departments, while the allocation of funds for social development was maintained at the minimum level and people's needs were virtually ignored.

These problems are universal in character, but in our country they have acquired an ethnic hue.

In general, there is a foundation in our economy on which we can rely, but there is also much work to be done.

In assessing the situation in the **intellectual sphere** of our multi-ethnic country's life, it is necessary to give credit to the large-scale work of historic dimensions, both in terms

of volume and importance, that has made it possible to save from complete extinction or revive and reintroduce many unique national traditions and give a strong impulse to the culture of all people.

The phrase that some ethnic groups first had their written language under Soviet Government has become trite. But what does this mean? Take away from a person the ability to speak and write in his native language and to know the history and legends of his people, and he will lose his sense of kinship and therefore spirituality, even if he is quite well off materially.

The Leninist policy of the cultural revolution in this country has produced impressive results despite all the deformations that occurred.

Today every nation has its own scientific and artistic intelligentsia, the carrier of its culture, through which it gains access to the values of other Soviet nations, to the world's treasures of knowledge and artistic classics. Each republic has scientific centers, universities and institutes, a wide network of public education, its own theaters. National cinema, painting and architecture are developing. But it is known that many areas of scientific and artistic creative endeavor cannot develop without all-round state support, the care and attention of society. Soviet power took charge of all this, and this is its greatest humanistic mission.

Speaking about the results of our intellectual development, it is impossible to ignore the growing interaction of national cultures. Joint life and our peoples' advance along the socialist road resulted in the formation of a Soviet culture, marked by the rich diversity of national peculiarities and traditions.

These are also the worthy fruits of cooperation between fraternal nations. And we take pride in them.

But it is all the more intolerable that along with the bright manifestations of the socialist way of life, acute problems have accumulated in this sphere. Thousands of successful national regions, as well as settlement and village Soviets, created in the 1920s, were unjustifiably eliminated. Problems arose in satisfying the national requirements of the people of various nationalities who, owing to natural processes, found themselves resettled in all regions of the country.

The problems involved in the development of languages and everything that is language-related—education, publishing and use in various spheres of state and public life—have acquired an especially acute character. Under the influence of economic, social and demographic factors the sphere of usage of national languages was reduced, a process that was interpreted as proof of former theories on the forced merger of nations, which were raised to the level of program-setting principles.

Although these processes caused legitimate anxiety and concern in society, sensible attempts to investigate them in greater depth and find a rational solution were often regarded as nationalism with all the consequences stemming from this. As a result, the role of national languages of some people was diminished. Their wish to preserve and develop the mother tongue, to multiply the values of their culture are quite understandable.

It is extremely important to work out a clear position on this vital problem which has acquired a political nature and affects the interests of the whole of the country's population, a position taking account of all equitable aspirations and based on general consensus.

Such are the main results of the development of our multinational country, such are the realities of Soviet society, naturally in the most general outline, from which we should proceed when elaborating national policy in modern conditions.

II.

Comrades, the draft CPSU platform, submitted for discussion by the plenary meeting naturally sets out the general approach towards the outstanding problems because taking specific decisions is the prerogative of the supreme bodies of state power of the USSR and union republics.

The platform aroused great interest in the party, in every section of society, among members of all ethnic groups inhabiting the country. Its fundamental points met with broad support.

Many opinions and interesting proposals were made. Some provisions came under criticism, we should admit this.

The party platform was closely studied abroad as well. This is due both to keen interest in Soviet perestroyka and to the fact that interethnic issues today are pressing in many countries and are, I would say, of a global nature.

As you examined the draft platform, you must have noticed that its entire contents are mostly directly connected with the package of tasks addressed in the framework of perestroyka and political and economic reform.

This is only natural, revealing the effective dialectic link that must be considered by us in both politics and practical activities.

We have set the task of restructuring and updating society on the basis of Lenin's ideas and principles. But all our experience, both in the past and now, demonstrates that we cannot count on success with perestroyka unless we solve the problems of interethnic relations.

Likewise, we cannot solve these problems and promote the development of the Soviet federation unless we carry perestroyka further and democratize and humanize socialist society.

I would also like to note it is not by chance that we stress the need to update the nationality policy. We do not mean, however, to reject what has been done so far.

Now that society has changed dramatically, it is vital to work out a nationality policy that will ensure the resolution of urgent problems in the country's development and correspond to today's realities.

These are the attitudes underlying the platform. Its deeper philosophical meaning, if you like, consists in determining the optimum correlations between the international and the national and optimum ways to apply this Marxist-Leninist idea today.

In practical and political terms, it means ensuring conditions for the free and comprehensive development of every ethnic group and the consolidation of our union, which is the source of well-being for all our people.

The central issue that deserves special attention is the manner in which to realize Lenin's principle of the self-determination of nations today.

Many aberrations were in evidence in this respect in past decades. They have also struck root, regrettably, in the public mentality. This is why we should clear up this issue of fundamental significance to our theory and policy.

First of all, it ought to be emphasized that the party will consistently pursue a Leninist nationality policy, including such a basic principle as the right of nations to self-determination.

Claims that the self-determination of the USSR's people has not been effected in reality and attempts to reduce self-determination just to secession and thereby impair this universal principle of solving the national question are futile and should be denounced.

All our experience as well as the experience of others demonstrates the need to view self-determination not only as a one- off act connected with the exercise of the right to secede.

It is a complicated, many-sided process of affirming national dignity, developing language and culture, consolidating political independence, and advancing economic and social progress.

From this point of view, the gamut of measures effected as part of perestroyka means a new and landmark stage in implementing nations' rights to self-determination.

In present-day conditions the principle is best reflected in self-management, protecting ethnic identity and the right of each ethnic group to enjoy all the fruits of sovereignty and to decide all issues of its development—economic, political and cultural—as it sees fit.

At the same time self-management presupposes the voluntary association of republics and national entities in the name of resolving tasks common to all, and their organic involvement in the advance of the whole country.

The current phase in the self-determination of nations makes it imperative to markedly broaden the rights of republics and decisively remove the distortions and deformities of the past, whose adverse effects are still being felt in various areas of society's life.

What is suggested in the first place is a package of measures to consolidate the political independence of union republics and give real substance to their sovereignty.

The clear delimiting of the powers of central and republican bodies of power will enable the latter to decide all issues of their life on their own, except issues which they will voluntarily delegate for decision-making by the union and in the resolution of which they will, incidentally, take part as well through respective political mechanisms.

While the Union will retain the powers needed to perform the common tasks of the federation, it is proposed to make fundamental changes to earlier procedures whereby the Union had the right to take up and decide virtually any issue, making the competence and sovereignty of republican authorities in many ways a mere formality. In this way, the problem of prioritizing federal law or republican law will be resolved.

The new character of the relations in the federation should find its legal guarantees in the USSR Constitution.

Elaborating on an idea I have already mentioned, I would like to say that broader rights for republics and their stronger sovereignty should be reflected in their substantially increased influence on the affairs of the country as a whole.

The new structures of state power created in the course of political reform contain many elements to ensure this.

These elements include the make-up of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium and planned working procedures for the Constitutional Compliance Committee. It is now suggested to go further, furnishing not only legal but also political conditions for broader and more active participation by republics when dealing with issues facing the country as a whole.

Such an approach must find reflection in personnel policy. We must ensure the extensive participation of representatives of all our people in federal state and public bodies, in the administrative apparatus. This must be done with due account for their professional standards, of course.

Urgent questions of the Russian Federation development must be considered in the context of problems linked with our federation's restructuring, and the further expansion of the rights and consolidation of the

sovereignty of union republics. They were spotlighted during recent discussions both in the Russian Federation and the country as a whole.

The Russian Federation is the most complicated national-political and cultural-ethnical system both in respect to its position in the Union and its internal structure. The powerful revolutionary shifts, started by the 1917 October Revolution, have radically changed the image of Russia. The role played by Russia and the Russian people in the country's adoption of revolutionary reforms, in surmounting the economic and cultural backwardness of many people, in defending the October achievements, is well known.

However, the committed deformations have had a negative effect on Russia, just as on all the other union republics. This is borne out by unfavorable demographic trends, numerous facts testifying to the irrational exploitation of natural resources and their squandering, obvious neglect of such truly Russian lands as the non-black earth belt and several other regions.

An acute ecological situation has developed in Kuzbass, the Urals, the Volga regions, on Lake Baykal, and in the Northern regions due to grave miscalculations in the location and development of production forces. Many territories, regions and autonomous formations are obviously lagging behind in their social development. There is legitimate concern about the preservation and restoration of priceless ancient monuments with which the history and culture of the Russian and other people of the republic are inseparably linked. Public opinion in Russia and throughout the country is seriously troubled by the lot of the small nationalities inhabiting the country's North, Siberia and the Far East.

A solution to all of these problems calls for thorough and far- reaching measures, both organisational and political. In keeping with numerous proposals, the platform maps out ways to improve the state structure of the Russian Federation, its standing in the union. These proposals were broadly discussed and approved both in the Russian Federation and in the union as a whole. We note this with satisfaction. I think the plenary meeting of the Central Committee will support these proposals. As to the formation of republican party structures, we can already address these questions.

In responses to the platform, the part that deals with the long-term transition to management by the regions, concern is voiced over the fact that this transition may lead to weaker links between them. I should say that this concern is groundless. On the contrary, perfecting economic management at territorial level will not only facilitate the solution of social, ecological and other tasks at the local level [illegible] it will also promote labor cooperation between all parts of Russia, the dynamic development of the Russian Federation as an integrated economic and political body in the interests of all people populating it.

Giving a new status to Soviet autonomy has great significance in efforts aimed at transforming the Soviet Federation. This is the essence of the proposals of the platform relating to the extension of the rights of autonomous republics in all fields of state, economic and cultural development, and to the strengthening of their economic independence. The same goal is pursued by giving broader rights to the autonomous regions and territories, by granting the possibility to create national regions in places where a population is dominated by a particular nationality, and by forming nationwide soviets of citizens belonging to large nations, which do not have their own territorial autonomy.

You possibly notice that proposals have been made that would transform one type of autonomy into another and wishes have been expressed that would change some autonomous republics into union ones.

Comrades, it should be said with all certainty: If we are realists and take account of the situation in which we find ourselves at present, the most important point is that the rights of people who have gained self-determination in such a form should be significantly extended and dependably guaranteed.

I will raise another issue of principle. Responses to the platform contain proposals on territorial changes, on redrawing the borders of national, state and administrative entities. Various arguments are cited to prove this. The plenary meeting should work out a firm and clear-cut position on this score. We proceed from the fact that the current national-territorial division presents no obstacles to people of all nationalities being able to live normally anywhere in the country. Efforts should be primarily aimed at creating the appropriate conditions. To embark now on recarving the country's adminstrative and territorial map would mean only complicating what is already the difficult situation, to delay indefinitely the attainment of the real goals of perestroyka, which aim to improve the life of the whole of Soviet people, all nations.

Our new nationality policy is designed to provide broad possibilities for meeting the specific interests of every nation and at the same time strengthening the guarantees of citizens' rights, irrespective of their nationality. The platform names a number of measures aimed at attaining this goal. I would add that they wholly correspond to the obligations which we took on the international arena. Implementing them, we at the same time tackle important issues of forming a rule-of-law socialist state in the USSR.

It should be borne in mind that more than 60 million people live outside their national republics as a result of economic, social and demographic processes and inter-ethnic migration. Naturally it is impossible to solve any problems without taking into account the legitimate interests and rights of these fellow citizens. Any discrimination here is impermissible.

Protecting the rights and freedoms of man, citizen or individual, is one of the most vital conditions for the development of modern civilisation. At the recent

meeting of the representatives of countries, signatories to the Helsinki agreement, in Vienna the USSR signed its final document.

I recall this, in particular, because in the conditions of a really functioning federal state, the task of renewing legislation on citizens' rights becomes multifaceted.

I refer not to the union laws alone. The republics also are obliged to observe all international pacts, signed on behalf of the Soviet Union and, consequently, on behalf of all republics which make it up.

It is necessary to strengthen the protection of the rights of Soviet citizens everywhere. It is all the more important since cases of discrimination against people on an ethnic basis are multiplying. We encounter ever increasing attempts by enemies of perestroyka, antisocial elements and groups to play "the nationalist card," to channel people's displeasure, which has accumulated over decades, into the sphere of inter-ethnic relations. Any manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, or the instigation of enmity to any nation, are unacceptable to us.

We have and will steer a firm course towards the democratic development of society. But one should differentiate between peaceful demonstrations and meetings, held in the framework of the Constitution, and extremist rallies which provoke inter-ethnic clashes and terrorize and intimidate people of other nationalities. With regard to such people and groups, spinelessness and indulgence are simply pernicious and at times criminal. The events in Transcaucasia, the Fergana region and Novyy Uzen seem to leave little doubts on this score.

Soviet laws envisage punishment for instigating national strife and law-enforcement bodies should ensure their unconditional observance. We cannot reconcile ourselves with the fact that many crimes on a national basis actually remain unpunished due to failings in the mechanism of justice. The time has also come to talk with the clear and forcible language of law, about conditions under which nationalist, chauvinistic and other extremist organisations can and should be banned and disbanded by the court. (Applause) I will say definitely: We shouldn't veer from the road of solving all problems by political methods, but where the acuteness of the situation dictates, where the threat to the safety and life of people arises, we will move decisively using the whole force of Soviet laws. (Applause)

In this connection I would like to dwell on the current situation in Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh. The conflict here has become protracted and extremely acute. Comrades know that from the very beginning we sought to settle it by political means to prevent complications in the normal life and work of the population of the autonomous region and both republics.

Numerous meetings were held at the CPSU Central Committee with the leaders of Armenia and Azerbaijan, deputies of the Supreme Soviets of the republics and representatives of workers. The USSR Council of Ministers endorsed a large-scale resolution, aimed at solving the region's social problems. Later a committee of special administration in Nagorno-Karabakh was set up. High-powered commissions were sent there on many occasions, including from the Congress of People's Deputies.

Unfortunately all these measures did not bring the expected results. National strife has flared up to such a degree that the development of the situation can have unpredictable consequences. The tens of thousands of people who have fled their native regions, the disruptions to transportation, and the endless strikes and direct clashes represent the situation today. I will put it bluntly: We stand before the need to take resolute measures, we cannot allow anarchy, let alone bloodshed. We are obliged to exert every effort to foster normal conditions for the life of the people, to ensure confidence in the future.

I think that we should appeal on behalf of the plenary meeting to the leadership and working people of Armenia and Azerbaijan to stop, to realise that further instigation of the conflict will bring pernicious consequences for the two nations who had lived as neighbors for centuries and should continue to live in this way. (Applause)

Comrades, work to ensure radical transformations of the federation is inseparably linked with perfecting economic relations and management.

These problems were sufficiently fully covered in the platform. Without anticipating the results of its discussion, I would like to express some views on this score.

First of all, we should not be misled by the current difficulties in the elaboration of principled economic solutions for the future. These solutions should take account both of objective requirements in developing integration on the basis of the division of labor and the need for economic independence.

In modern conditions tendencies towards autarchy and atempts by relatively prosperous republics and regions to isolate themselves and fence themselves off would be extremely dangerous. This can bring highly negative consequences for those who embark upon this road.

We need at this plenary meeting to say this once again in the face of all people of the Soviet Union so that they do not give in to demagogues, who conceal what the implementation of their slogans, serviced under the "pleasant sauce" of independence, secession, etc, may lead to. This is irresponsible gambling with the destinies of the people. Who will ever undertake to divide, recarve the current intertwined society bound up by all economic, political, social, spiritual, human and family links? Only adventurists can make such calls. (Applause)

Today the basis of scientific, technological, economic and social progress is the rational division of labor,

integration, the use of the potential accumulated by the whole of society. This is illustrated not only by our experience but also by that of the world.

In our conditions the more organic inclusion of all the republics and regions into the nationwide division of labor has fundamental significance for their effective development. True, some comrades complain that we have problems with the division of labor and pricing, that the discipline of meeting contractual obligations is low. All this is true. But is it possible today when we set long- term economic goals to base our projections only on the statement of the failings of the system, which we inherited from the past?

These can and should be rectified as economic reform makes headway, and we are busy making sure that it does.

This is what should be the subject of discussion in the first place—how to carry out reform in order to remove all concerns and everything that has harmed the economic development of both the country as a whole and its individual regions.

We know well that within the thoroughly centralized administer- by-command system, funds were siphoned off for no good reason not only from go-ahead enterprises to laggards but also from some economic regions to others.

To put it bluntly, the bungled management and idleness of some were financed at the expense of others. This was obviously at odds with the basic principle of socialism and engendered parasitic attitudes.

The implementation of measures outlined in the platform will make it possible to abolish these abnormalities sapping motivation in the results of economic activity.

We have already embarked upon this path, by supporting the relevant initiatives of Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Similar proposals are being prepared for other republics and regions.

This approach will enable everyone to display enterprise, and stimulate economic efficiency. There will be growth in funds left to republican and local governing bodies, which can be used to meet social needs.

The economic position of a republic or a region will depend on its own economic results.

While stressing the high significance of the principle of economic independence, we should view it in organic connection with the changeover of enterprises to complete cost-accounting. This is especially vital to understand for all of us, comrades, because there is still a lot of confusion on the issue.

It should be said openly that real independence cannot be achieved without completing this central task. All the more so, centralized dictates may not be allowed to just shift from one level to another.

In this case, the federal market, which we want to upgrade and which should have cost-accounting enterprises as its key figures, would be divided by regional fences.

But is this what we seek? Issues arising in this case will have to be resolved not in a single center but in 15 or hundreds of centers.

We recently met with comrades from the Baltic region and the issue of the RAF mini-bus factory was brought up.

A good enterprise, it builds needed vehicles which are used domestically and are also exported. It receives components from several hundred other factories across the country. If RAF decides to upgrade the model, all of these factories will have to be involved.

As a result, the cost-accounting of enterprises has become the central issue of economic independence. Both the republic and local governing councils are going to benefit from it, as they will receive deductions from enterprises at standard rates.

In other words, we vitally need far-reaching decentralization in the economy. It is just as vital to fulfil federal programs connected with developing basic industries, the production infrastructure and fundamental research, maintaining the country's reliable defence capability, solving major ecological problems, dealing with the effects of natural disasters, and with the nation's involvement in the international economy and politics.

Despite the impressive results of the policy to "even out the differences," serious problems still remain in this field.

I would like to ask: Shouldn't we set up, when switching over to regional cost-accounting, a system of economic levers and incentives that will enable us, by effectively using funds from the state budget, to consistently resolve the pressing problems of the regions that lag behind?

I believe that the government ought to be given this task right away. This work is closely connected with the granting of economic independence to republics.

Issues of property almost invariably end up at the center of debates on economic aspects of interethnic relations.

Refining socialist property is the key issue of perestroyka. Let us be blunt: Without changes that are long overdue in this area, we shall not be able to overcome the alienation of working people from the means of production, fully restore interest in worthy and conscientious work, and encourage economic initiative and resourcefulness.

The fact that the issue remains unresolved affects practical matters, including the need to delimit the functions of federal, republican and local governing councils in an optimum way.

We shall have a broad-based discussion of this problem. For now, I would like to say the following: the changeover to regional cost-accounting and economic independence emphasizes the question of how to use the economic potential accumulated in the country rationally and to the greatest effect.

Discussions now under way in society sometimes produce proposals which, if accepted as the basis of policy, may push us from one extreme to another.

We want to break from excessive centralization and departmental arbitrariness in relation to republics and regions. We are looking for solutions that will make them economically independent and help throw off the shackles that hamper efficient work. This is correct and is a natural reaction to the sway of central ministries and agencies that continue to make all republics and regions groan, even today.

This sway is the bedrock of the administer-by-command system of management, which, it is now clear to everyone, has outlived itself.

But it is important to realize that, when adopting new forms of economic endeavor, we should make full use of everything positive that has been achieved during the development of the Soviet federation as an integral state.

We have a comprehensively interconnected power grid and an energy supply system. They are the foundation of our economy, the basis for both the confident work of production collectives and the resolution of consumer issues in all republics.

The transport and communications systems and other important parts of the production infrastructure have also been developed along the same principles, keeping in mind national and regional needs.

So, comrades, should we destroy all this now? This suggestion reminds me of the "revolutionary" slogan calling for the dismantling of the tsar-built railway between Moscow and Petersburg.

It is necessary to analyze thoroughly the concepts suggested and, above all, to foresee all the probable consequences of their implementation.

In working out a new economic policy that will meet the tasks and goals of perestroyka and the development of the federation and in filling this policy with new content, we ought to do everything in a well-considered way, a cool headed manner, rather than on the basis of emotions, ambitions and abstract notions.

This is an extremely important undertaking that involves peoples' vital interests and we should not fall into confusion or make hasty decisions. This would have irreparable consequences.

And in no case should we adopt decisions to the accompaniment of foot stamping and "hand clapping" that is masterminded by certain groups.

If we see only errors and miscalculations in the past and do not see the realities that were formed over decades, can we speak of serious politics?

This is not a university department where one can say whatever one chooses—anything goes. I would not like this to be viewed as a manifestation of a negative attitude towards scientists for that is not the case.

Without science and its responsible contribution, we would not be able to do anything, nor would we be able to understand anything. But I do not like incompetent people to impose political concepts on us by foot stamping. (Applause)

In other words, I would like to stress that all of our approaches and decisions should display a high degree of competence and an equally high degree of responsibility.

Naturally, we ought to take into account the radically changing situation in connection with economic restructuring in the country.

At present laws on ownership, on land, on lease and lease relations, on the economic independence of republics, on local economy and self-management, and on the uniform taxation system will be submitted for discussion to the Supreme Soviet on a top-priority basis.

Altogether, these laws mean a drastic change in the relations of production. I would say, comrades, that the point at issue is a new stage in our revolution.

Under these conditions, it is impossible to view the nationality issue separately from the profound social and economic processes unfolding in the country.

We are on the correct path and we should be firm in defending the chief directions of the policy of perestroyka. It is being claimed that we are unable to resolve problems facing the country without introducing capitalism into the economy.

On the other hand, I would say that it is being claimed by the right that the entire policy of perestroyka was imposed on us by the West. This is nonsense.

Let us not be nervous but build on the main direction of perstroyka by tapping the potential of socialism and democracy, the potential of the federation, by freeing the spiritual and intellectual potential of our society and by reinvigorating socialism. This is the point at issue. (Applause)

In this way, economic as well as political factors convincingly speak in favor of the transformation and further development of the Soviet Federation on the basis of the maximum consolidation of the republics' and regions' economic independence on the one hand, and the strengthening of the common economic complex on the other.

In considering the entire range of issues related to the further tapping of the Soviet Federation's potential, we

should be especially attentive and considerate with regard to everything related to the intellectual sphere.

This applies to science, culture, traditions and many other things that make our people rich.

But today I would like to mention the language problem that has become very acute. What should our policy be like?

First of all, we proceed from the premise that the indigenous inhabitants of all republics have undoubtedly the full right to establish their tongue as the state language or, in other words, to create legal conditions for its preservation and development.

But this, comrades, is not merely a legal issue. This is a political issue related to the well-being of our people and their understandable aspiration to preserve their national integrity.

At the same time, all people of our counry are vitally interested in having a means of inter-ethnic communication, which the Russian language has become in our conditions, for objective reasons.

The reality is that thanks to this language, all Soviet people are able to apply their energies and knowledge much more extensively and gain access to achievements in Soviet and world science and culture.

You can judge from the material distributed to you that many comrades who have participated in discussing the platform and represent different ethnic groups think it expedient to give the Russian language the status of common state language across the USSR. (Applause)

We regard this proposal as deserving the attention and support of the higher bodies of power. Its implementation will in no way infringe upon the rights of any ethnic group, while providing a serious legal basis for promoting economic, political and cultural contacts between different poeple in our multinational country, their joint creative activities and active involvement in international affairs.

We can now see imbalances in some regions, and just look at what they have led to.

Continuing the examination of language problems, we have to acknowledge the right of all national minorities to use their native languages. This applies to people of dozens of ethnic groups living in different republics.

We recently saw with alarm and pain how language problems separated and divided people in some regions, provoking rallies, demonstrations and strikes that lasted for many days and badly affected the economy and living standards.

Party and social organisations, state agencies, unions of cultural workers and all those vested with power and exercising influence on public opinion are duty-bound to do everything possible to put an end to this dangerous whirlwind of mutual recriminations, grievances and ultimatums.

Permit me to voice confidence that these problems will be settled and all languages spoken in our multinational motherland will be given full scope for development on the suggested basis, which meets all democratic traditions and legal norms in the world. (Applause)

The role of the church in inter-ethnic relations is an issue that affects the problem we are discussing today. It is known that in the past major clashes, hostility and strife between members of different ethnic groups largely resulted from religious intolerance.

This factor frequently makes itself felt today as well. We appreciate the fact that the Russian Orthodox, Islamic and other churches hold peace-making positions, and hope that they will use their influence and their possibilities to help avert and overcome inter-ethnic conflicts.

The churches today can pursue their activities in normal social conditions fully in keeping with constitutional principles. This can be seen most strikingly in the fact that some of their prominent representatives have been elected to the Congress of People's Deputies.

A law on freedom of conscience, which is being drafted, should regulate the entire range of problems connected with the position and activities of religious organisations under modern conditions.

Comrades, I hope that everything I have said promotes a better understanding of the meaning and significance of the proposed party platform on the national question. Our party favors a major and strong federal state, as it is convinced that this meets the interests of all ethnic groups united in the Soviet Union. (Applause)

This was Lenin's position and this is the position we abide by today as well.

It is important to have a clear view of all economic, political, intellectual and, if you want, moral foundations for strengthening and developing our union. Let's put the question in this way: What does it give to the republics?

First of all, being part of one of the most powerful states, which possesses huge natural resources, a developed economic complex, an arsenal of scientific knowledge, technical possibilities and rich culture, capable of reliably defending its security. Each ethnic group in the USSR gets the possibility of taking part in the formation and development of common intellectual values, to have access to them and assert itself on a nationwide and world scale through them. The union enables all people to take part in international relations, actively affect the course of world events. The mechanism of implementing the rights of union republics, as regards their participation in international activity, should be worked out with a view to current conditions.

These are permanent factors. But there is a factor connected with the current historical moment. The revolutionary renewal of Soviet socialist society is the main argument in favour of strengthening our union. It was perestroyka that led us to transforming the Soviet Federation as an important constituent part of the processes of democratisation and renewal of the country. Only on the road of perestroyka, I am convinced of this, can all acute and difficult problems of the development of people and national relations on the whole be successfully tackled.

Finally, comrades, I will dwell on the CPSU's role in the conditions of the transformation of our federation. The fate of our multinational state largely depends on how the party will act in the new situation.

From the very beginning our party was built as an organisation of co-thinkers, inspired by the ideas of proletarian internationalism. The process of its establishment was far from simple. Under Lenin's guidance the party was formed as a single organisation with a single program and rules, mandatory for all members, built on the basis of democratic centralism.

At the same time it should be stressed that internationalist beginnings in the party did not mean at all any disregard to the interests and peculiarities of one national group or another. This was achieved thanks to the correct interpretation of the principles of democratic centralism. Subsequently, however it began to be distorted, which led to heavy reliance on centralism, to the prejudice of democracy, and inevitably affected the position and practical activity of party organisations, including in the republics and other national entities.

Today we should fully retore Lenin's understanding of the principle of democratic centralism which envisages the active and vigorous activity of all party organisations, their real independence in matters of organisation, personnel policy and in other spheres.

It implies unity of action based on the elaboration of common political and ideological positions, rather than barracks-style discipline and unconditional obedience.

The platform sets out some practical steps to expand the independence of republican party organisations, including their right to handle issues of their organisation, determine the structure of party bodies and adopt political decisions.

The enrichment of the federal structure inevitably affects the role of the republican party organisations. They should be given an opportunity to adopt their programmes of action within the framework of the party programme.

We have decided to convene the next (28th) party congress, the agenda of which includes the elaboration and adoption of new party rules. Obviously, issues of the activity of the republican communist parties will be properly reflected in the rules with due account for the transformations in the federation.

While adopting all these overdue measures, we should resolutely reject the federalisation of the party. I will put it bluntly: This would mean the end of our party as it was founded by Lenin and would inflict irreparable damage to perestroyka and the entire cause of socialism. The one who followed this path would assume most grave responsibility before the party and the people.

Among the proposals that deserve support I will single out the establishment of a Party Central committee commission on the nationality policy and ethnic relations and similar commissions at the central committees of the republican party organisations, regional and city party committees—where this is, naturally, dictated by the composition of the population and the need to keep nationality problems constantly in view.

Comrades who think that one of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee secretaries should be assigned exclusively to handle these issues are probably right.

The restructuring of the party, of which the 28th congress will become a major milestone, will make it possible to fulfil the extraordinarily crucial tasks that have emerged at the current stage of our society's development.

And, of course, comrades, the stance of party members is acquiring huge importance today. Developments in various regions have shown that some of them have yielded to the excitement of national emotions, do not oppose nationalist tendencies or, what is worse, are being drawn into them.

The party and its organisations neither can nor should put up with this. Internationalism has been and remains a major element of our outlook and part of the ideological credo of communists.

In conclusion I would like to say the following. We all understand the complexity of the nationality issue and what acute problems it involves. This is a delicate and fine issue that demands respect, patien[illegible] and restraint.

We have come to the plenum to discuss precisely in this spirit the outstanding issues and, with due account for the views and sentiments of our people and the entire society, to find an optimal solution to the difficult nationalities problems.

Everything must be done to make our plenum a turning point, so that it creates conditions for improving the situation in the country and further developing our federation in the interests of all Soviet people.

CPSU Central Committee Plenum Continues 20 Sep

LD2009062689 Moscow TASS in English 0617 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee resumed its plenary meeting at 10 o'clock [0600 GMT] today.

The plenum's participants are discussing agenda issues.

Approves Nationalities Platform

LD2009153289 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Excerpt] In Moscow the full-scale meeting of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party has unanimously approved the platform on the nationalities policy of the party at the present stage. [passage omitted]

Karimov Opens Debate

LD2009095789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Report on debate in 20 September CPSU Central Committee plenum session; speakers include: Karimov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan; Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar CPSU Obkom; and Vagris, first secretary of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee.]

[Text] The plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU resumed work in Moscow at 1000. Those taking part are continuing discussion of the report by Comrade Gorbachev on the national policy of the party in current conditions. Today's debate was opened by Comrade Karimov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. He said, inter alia:

[Begin recording] [Karimov] Comrades, we by no means think that the causes of the tragic events which occurred in Fergana should be simplified. Far from it: We condemn such attempts and consider them to be politically harmful. The events of the Fergana oblast show first and foremost that we underestimated the danger of the worsening of the tense social and political situation, the attempts by anti-perestroyka, corrupted, and nationalistic minded elements to make use of the exceptionally complex social, economic, moral and psychological situation in the republic to give birth to national discord, and to make use of the religious feelings of the population to whip up and destabilize the situation.

Today we draw severe and bitter lessons of political realism, lessons of truth from the Fergana events. Yes, we could and should have prevented, we had an obligation to avert, the mass disorders, excesses, savagery, and human casualties. Yes, we bear the responsibility for the fact that tens of thousands of people were forced to leave the places where they resided. This scale of events showed up first and foremost the political bankruptcy of many of our party and soviet cadres, and their inability to foresee and avert the extraordinary situation and control events. The events also showed up the helplessness of the law enforcement bodies, their lack of activity, and sometimes their direct connivance with the extremists.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan made a harsh evaluation of the tragic events in Fergana oblast. The guilty have been and are being brought to party and criminal responsibility. The firm conviction has arisen in the country that the guilty, whoever they may be, to whichever nation they belong, must and will be subjected to severe punishment so that no one will ever again think of casting a shadow over the good name of the Uzbek peole, of whom genuine internationalism, good will, goodness of heart, and hospitality are characteristic. The Uzbek people have always been, are, and will be the true brother of all soviet peoples.

Comrades, we see no sense in looking for an alternative to the federal structure of our state. Yes, we favor sharply limiting the functions, competencies, and mutual obligations of the Union and republics, and of strengthening all round the sovereignty of the republics—as the draft platform says—building our mutual relations on complete financial autonomy. We are in favor of giving the concept of the Soviet Federation new content. The proposals by individual republics that our relations should be formed on the principles of confederation are completely unacceptable to us. We are profoundly convinced that this would inevitably lead to parochialism being increased in the localities, to the development of centrifugal forces and attitudes, and in the last resort would lead to the collapse of our state. [end recording]

Comrade Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar CPSU Obkom, then took the rostrum. He spoke about the fact that the CPSU platform on the nationalities issue has given rise to lively interest among the working people of Tataria. During its discussion, numerous proposals were voiced for strengthening people's friendship and internationalist ties. Comrade Usmanov went on to say:

[Begin Usmanov recording] As is well known, people found themselves in an unequal position as a result of the deformation of Leninist nationality policy. Some acquired the status of union republic, others that of an autonomous republic, while some were deprived of both. Today this circumstance is giving rise to justified criticism, and sometimes to a painful reaction from people. The reality is such that many autonomous republics, which are not inferior to certain union republics in their economic, scientific-technical, and intellectual potential, their population, and other parameters, have far fewer possibilities to develop. The difference is felt in literally everything. The sphere of legislative activity is restricted; their rights and opportunities in the economy and in the social sphere are limited. A considerable proportion of purely internal issues must be resolved only by the center. The ranking system of the republics which formed consolidated not only the hierarchy of national statehood, but also that of national cultures.

The [word indistinct] potential of autonomous republics is of an order lower than that of union republics: for instance, in the volume of republican radio broadcasting, television, publishing, the development of cinematography, the mass information media, and other matters. This has already been addressed by the secretaries of oblast party committees of autonomous republics who have spoken from this rostrum. And in the current situation, all this is far from isolated; it also has a very marked influence on people's national self-awareness.

In this context I would like to say first of all that the CPSU platform on the nationalities issue must reflect the idea that it is possible for the forms of national statehood and autonomy to develop and for new national formations to arise. Nations and national relations develop, after all. For some reason, however, national forms of existence have ossified over many decades. This is, incidentally, recognized in the CPSU draft platform, too. I think, however, that this should be formulated more precisely; that the possibility of an increase in the status of any autonomous unit, and of its transition to higher forms of national statehood as it progresses politically, socioeconomically, and intellectually, and as its national self-awareness grows, should be laid down in legislation. [end recording]

In his speech Yan Vagris, first secretary of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee, analyzed certain provisions of the CPSU platform on the nationalities question. He dealt in particular with the competence and mutual obligations of the union and of the republic.

[Begin recording] [Vagris] The party's political attitude to the actual formulation of the question is set out in the section: How to restructure the Soviet Federation and make it full-blooded. But one cannot fail to see its internal contradictions. For example, in subsection 1, there is first an enumeration of what should be assigned to the union, though this is more in the nature of a list of the general functions of a federative state, without any definition of the framework of competence to exercise them. Further on, it quite correctly asserted that the republics have the power to settle all questions of state and social life with the exception of those which they voluntarily transfer to the authority of the Union. If we want to be consistent and take account of the main thesis proclaimed above which states that the guarantee of the durability of our federation is the voluntary conjunction of the Soviet republics into a single state or Union in which each republic retains its independence and has the right to participate in the taking of common decisions, as the platform says, then it must be acknowledged that the rights of the republics must be primary, since the republics form the Union, and not the other way round.

Consequently, the very logic of things dictates that we ought to begin with something else: The definition of the fullness of the rights and competence of the republic. We must then go on to define the extent of those limitations of their sovereignty to which the Union Republics must consciously and voluntarily assent for the sake of the existence and sucessful development of the Union state. It is my view that this must be taken into consideration by the Congress of People's Deputies during the final drafting of these documents.

Thus we say that the sovereignty of the Union republics should be real, not merely formal; and that they should have a new status. We say that our federation must be given a modern content—but we certainly do not advocate its destruction. [end recording]

Gostelradio Chairman Addresses Plenum

LD2009112989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Part" of speech by Mikhail Nenashev, CPSU Central Committee member and chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in the Moscow Kremlin on 20 September; from the "Soyuz" program—recorded]

[Text] If we try to bring together all the recent concerns and anxieties, and pick out the most important one, this would certainly be the concern for the party's prestige, its combat readiness, and the people's confidence in it. The paradox of our time is that the party is the initiator of revolutionary changes, and the party is also the primary object of criticism; the basic cause, in the opinion of the most zealous reformers, of the difficulties and problems of the current time.

When you ponder this paradox, you begin to reflect that perhaps there is no paradox, but simply a natural phenomenon arising from the conditions of our unusual time, which perhaps we have not yet managed, or want, to understand completely. We are obliged to investigate all this in detail, soberly and without passion, I think, without dramatizing the situation—as Mikhail Sergeyevich said in his report—so as not to frighten ourselves, but also without underestimating it, for the situation in the country is indeed extremely serious.

Furthermore, it seems to me—and I would like to speak about this quite frankly—there really is more than enough criticism of the party today, and we mass media workers have certainly succeeded in this. But as for self-criticism—let us always be honest—we clearly do not yet have enough self-criticism. And in these 2 days at our plenum, it seems to me, it has not been heard either. At the same time, when we all analyze the complex problems in our life today, when we try to understand the reasons for the lagging in the economy, the lagging in education and science, when we reflect on the past, present, and future, we cannot fail to think about first causes. Why has the party not been able to oppose the distortion of socialism? And at the those sharp turning points when it found the strength to reveal the negative processes, and set out a positive program, the matter was restricted—this has been noted more than once—merely to changes at the top. We cannot fail to also think about how much these distortions and deviations from

Leninist principles have affected the party itself. I think that we Communists need to be frank, and see that the attitude to the party today, its fall in prestige, to a large extent derives from its distant, and not so distant, past, and, most of all, in its present. For we all know that its organizational methods, which are still to a large extent based on administrative-command methods, on unthinking obedience, do not form and do not strengthen our party, do not form its militants, (?or assign them) in the party; that the system of our political campaigning and propaganda is in many instances based on dogmatism, on drumbeat methods, and usually fails to convince people, does not arouse their interest, and to a large extent—irrrates people. Not to see this would simply be unjust.

Volskiy Warns of 'Interethnic War'

LD2009104689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Fragment" of speech by Arkadiy Ivanovich Volskiy, chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Special Administrative Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum in the Kremlin on 20 September; from the "Soyuz" program—recorded]

[Text] In my opinion the platform of the CPSU Central Committee and the report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev reflect a modern understanding and a new interpretation of the principles of the Leninist nationalities policy. It appears that the main thing is the development of the fundamental principle, the right of nations to self-determination. It should not be boiled down to merely republican sovereignty or to slogans advocating separation. It means both broader rights for all people to the possibility of creating any kind of form of national and cultural statehood within the framework of the USSR, and the right of every nation to resolve the question of the possibility of changing its statehood, the form of its statehood, within the bounds, of course, of the existing boundaries, and the right to renouce one's own autonomy and the resolution of the question of one's own distinctiveness in other politico-administrative forms. It is to just such an aim that perestoryka calls.

Now about Nagorno-Karabakh: I think that up to now we haven't been able to call things by their name, and to lay bare the entire profundity of the conflict which is taking place here. Yesterday in the report by Mikhail Gorbachev, perhaps for the first time, a harsh and just appraisal was given of the events which are taking place here. Having worked 1 year and 2 months in that region, I cannot predict immediate prospects for the restoration of a durable peace here if the sufficient essential measures are not taken. The reality is such that formal and informal leaders of Azerbaijan and Armenia, over Nagorno-Karabakh, are constantly heating up the situation and are not striving for good relations. There are no steps toward friendship, even toward acceptable mutual relations. Nobody wants to give way even on small things. If we look truth in the face, then today the republics are on the verge of interethnic war and often they step over this verge. At times the Karabakh question is linked with perestroyka. The news media of the West and certain of ours, too, get especially zealous over this. Believe me, comrade members of the Central Committee, there are no kind of grounds for this. Up to now perestroyka has not even reached our parts. The matter lies elsewhere: in the crude mistakes of the leading bodies of both republics—and we selected a preferential tactic in the call to make it up, to make friends, and so on, to sit down at a roundtable. [sentence as heard]

Undoubtedly this would be a way of somehow helping to check the escalation of the conflict. But recently formal and informal leaders have been openly ignoring these appeals—boycotting each other, and themselves inflaming passions among their people. Even in the tragic events of November and December of last year, when hundreds of people were exiled from the two republics, even then the leaders of the republican organizations did not come to their senses, did not wake up and extend to each other the hand of friendship. This mutual alienation, endless mutual recriminations, unwillingness to enquire into its causes, has been the main reason for the continuing tension in the region. Incidentally, even after the recent meeting at the Central Committee of the CPSU betwen members of the bureau of the Central Commitees of the Communist Parties of Azerbaijan and Armenia, not one agreed measure has been carried out.

This line is also having its effect upon the behavior of the broad masses. Conflicts are constantly flaring up in places with mixed population. People are being denied jobs on ethnic grounds. Schools are divided. There is stonethrowing on the roads. Hostages are being taken, and people are getting killed.

The country's leadership has continuously sought a way out of the situation. There is no doubt that the introduction of the special form of administration created an atmosphere which could have defused the situation; but in practice it failed in many respects. The documents on the special form of administration circulated in the offices for more than 4 months, till in the end they were hemmed about by so many qualifications that the positive element in the special administration—its positive element—was severely limited. And I don't know whether they would have been issued if Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov had not somehow forced their publication in May. The status of the committee still remains undefined. There is no statute dealing with it, and this has given the extremists a pretext for calling it unconstitutional. With its limited powers, the committee has been unable, on many issues, to carry out what was planned, especially in the field of the economy and in the social sphere, even though good beginnings have been made, which never previously existed here. But the main object has been achieved: Mass carnage has been avoided.

Dagestan Party Leader Speaks

LD2009121989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Comrade Yusupov, first secretary of the Dagestan Communist Party, was the last to speak before the interval. Here is an excerpt from his speech.

[Begin Yusupov recording] It can be said with certainty that not since Lenin have the peoples of the Soviet Union had such democratic opportunities for national choice as they have received under the conditions of perestroyka. Our present and future depend on how skillfully and wisely we use these opportunities. The question is whether we possess a political and moral culture that will prevent our getting carried away with the euphoria of national freedom, and that will permit us to arrive at a genuine internationalism that is perceived and implemented by way of the national existence of every people and every person. For this reason, the tenets which are expressed in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report with regard to the indissoluble unity of the national rebirth and international consolidation of our country's peoples can, in our opinion, become the basis for a plenum decision and for further practical work. This understanding was also the defintiive one in the discussion of the CPSU platform on the nationalities issue by the communists and working people of Dagestan.

We fully support the fundamental idea of the CPSU platform with regard to granting greater independence and freedom to the union republics. However, it seems to us that the radical renewal of nationalities policy and interethnic relations is only possible by granting the same real rights to all autonomous republics. This completely follows from the Marxist-Leninist concept of the equal rights of the people. I think that an open enumeration of powers is also necessary in order to ensure the sovereign rights of autonomous republics. We have become accustomed to the second-ranking position of autonomous republics. The draft platform suffers from this, too. The business of learning mother languages has also been largely a formal nature. Today we have already begun to consolidate the material and technical basis for the complete study of national languages and for the training of teaching staff. Eleven languages are studied in the republic's schools. This year the academic specialists have created alphabets for another three languages of the indigenous peoples. There is much work still ahead, however, but we are firmly convinced that it is possible and necessary to organize the normal study of mother languages and to raise their functional status without encroaching on the role and status of the Russian language, which is an irreplaceable means of communication between nationalities.

They [languages] can and must develop together. We do not understand why, when such an important issue is being considered in a number of places, emotions have suddenly taken the upper hand and haste is displayed, instead of a rational analysis of the problems, with people's real interests taken into account. [end recording]

Yazov Decries Nationalism in Armed Forces

LD2009140189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Speech by Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in the Kremlin on 20 September—recorded]

[Text] Internationalism, together with Soviet patriotism, today defines the spirit of our Army, the whole structure of its life and work. In its ranks serve representatives of all Soviet peoples. As a rule, there are 90-95 nationalities in the military districts; in divisions, 40-50; in units and ships, up to 30. These statistics in and of themselves are demonstrative, but, as you understand, behind them lie all the problems typical of the present stage of national development and relations among nationalities in our country.

It is impossible not to see that certain negative phenomena which have arisen in several republics have started to penetrate the soldiers' barracks and the sailors' quarters. This is manifested in incidents of national egotism and arrogance by individual servicemen, and the formation of cliques along national lines. Unprecedented instances have occurred of individuals who evade active military service, which is politically, socially, and morally alien to our system and to the very idea of defending the socialist homeland. Formations based on national groups and people from the same area have appeared in certain subunits. They try to put themselves in a privileged situation in relation to other servicemen and to dictate their egotistical conditions to them. Instances of so-called nonregulation relations are also increasingly taking on a nationalistic hue. All of this is an echo of the far from constructive processes which certain forces have succeeded in initating in several regions of the country. Judging by the nature of their actions, they cannot be called anything but nationalistic, separatist, extremist. These forces are trying to exploit truly complicated and acute nationalities problems. They have been sufficiently successful in making use of the new moral and political atmosphere in society which the party has created, an atmosphere of openness and democracy, to satisfy their own political ambitions.

Without proper discipline and with no qualms about lying, slandering, and fanning up base passions, they foist on thousands upon thousands of people—at times successfully—slogans which are full of enmity and hatred towards socialism, the party, and the Armed Forces. One recalls in connection with this that at the inception of Soviet power, substantiating the objective necessity of Soviet republics being united in the cause of defense, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin emphasized the vital importance of cohesion of all military forces into a mighty, internationalist Red Army. Not a single Soviet

republic on its own, he said, can regard itself as protected from economic exhaustion and military rout. These Leninist tenets are still relevant.

Further Reportage on 19 Sep Plenum Proceedings

PRAVDA Lists Plenum Speakers

PM2009075589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

["Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The routine CPSU Central Committee Plenum began work 19 September 1989. The following questions were submitted for the plenum's examination:

1. Convening the routine 28th CPSU Congress.
2. The party's nationalities policy in present-day conditions.

On the first item the plenum heard a speech by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and adopted the corresponding resolution, both being published in the press.

On the second question—"The party's nationalities policy in present-day conditions"—the plenum heard a report from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee (being published in the press).

The plenum participants were issued with materials generalizing the proposals and comments received during the discussion of the CPSU draft platform from party committees, Communists, state and social organizations, and scientists, on problems of interethnic relations and a roundup of working people's letters on these questions, as well as a number of reference items.

Speakers in the debates were: R.Kh. Khabibullin, first secretary of the Bashkir CPSU Oblast Committee [obkom], Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, Yu.N. Yelchenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, N.A. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, Yu.S. Karabasov, secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee [gorkom], Yu.N. Prokopyev, first secretary of the Yakutsk CPSU Obkom, R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, V.G. Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA, V.I. Vorotnikov, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, G.G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, V.I. Potapov, first secretary of the Irkutsk CPSU Obkom, A.-M.K. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, Yu.D. Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, A.N. Girenko, first secretary of the Crimean Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, B.I. Oleynik, writer and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, V.I. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, and D.G. Zavgayev, first secretary of the Chechen-Ingush CPSU Obkom.

The plenum formed an editorial commission to edit the CPSU draft platform "The party's nationalities policy in present-day conditions" and to prepare the plenum's resolution on the item under discussion.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum will continue work 20 September.

Vyalyas Addresses Plenum

LD1909225589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From feature on work of CPSU Central Committee plenum on 19 September]

[Text] Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke during the debate. Here is an excerpt from his address:

[Begin Vyalyas recording] I want to say quite definitely, and the recent party plenum has shown us that, we see our further progress only in close consolidation with the perestroyka forces of the whole country. A sovereign Estonia in a renewed federation of Soviet peoples is our aim. We share the CPSU Central Committee's concern expressed in the statement on the situation in the Baltic, with the actions here of certain separatist forces, with the destabilization of the political situation. But when we speak of party trust, probably it would have been better if we leaders of the Baltic republic had taken part, to a certain extent, in drawing up that document, and said that, yes, that document, might and probably should have appeared earlier, a year, or perhaps more. Perhaps then the content would have been different and some of our current problems would look different. Once again, I want to say, let's be honest. When afterwards a wave appears in the central press and television, it creates a negative stereotype about Estonia—and this is not always anonymous, as Comrade Afanasyev has said here. Please forgive me, but I think there's probably no need to go through the list here. [end recording]

Maslyukov, Others Speak

LD1909205189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From feature on CPSU Central Committee plenum proceedings on 19 September held in the Kremlin Palace, Moscow. Speakers include: Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee; Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee; Girenko, first secretary of the Crimean Oblast Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party; writer Boris Oleynik deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, and Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party central committee.]

[Text] Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, spoke in his address about the problems of regional financial autonomy, and how financial autonomy will be implemented in practice in the union republics.

Comrade Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke in the debate, and devoted great attention to the Nagorno-Karabakh problem.

[Begin Arutyunyan recording] The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] question is not a question of a territorial dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan. It was raised not by Armenia, but by the people of Nagorno-Karabakh themselves. It must be regarded purely and simply as a question of a people's self-determination. It is a matter of a people's will and of their sovereign right. To disregard that right is to discredit the party's nationalities policy. The CPSU platform rightly says that the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh must be tackled on a constitutional-legal and democratic basis, openly, and with the necessary participation of representatives from all interested sides. But I think it is of fundamental importance that the list includes a nation's right to self-determination, without which, as is known, there can be no genuinely democratic nationalities policy. [end recording]

Girenko, first secretary of the Crimean Oblast Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, dwelt in his speech on the ecological difficulties aggravating interethnic relations in the Crimea.

Writer Boris Oleynik, deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, proposed that a state body should be set up in the country to deal with nationality problems.

Comrade Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party central committee, is called upon to speak. He said in particular:

[Begin Gumbaridze recording] Age-old, fraternal bonds link the Georgian and Abkhazian people. They are conditioned by their historical residence together on one common territory, by common concerns, a common development, and common aspirations. Yes, they have been subjected to harsh trials, and misfortunes and adversities rained down on the Abkhazian people during the tragic times of the cult of personality, which did not spare either the Georgian or any other of our country's nations. But it would be unfair not to take note of all that has been given to Abkhazia by Soviet power during the decades of its existence—in the first instance, national development under the conditions of autonomy. Does not the fact that at the present time in multinational Abkhazia where Abkhazians comprise little more than 17 percent cadres of Abkhazian nationality occupy up to 40 percent of places in the elected bodies and more than half of leading political and economic posts say a lot?

In the recent past a decision by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee was made on the Abkhazian language. A national program for its development is now being prepared. One cannot fail to note how the Abkhazian population's standard of living has risen. There is no particular need here to resort to a statistical illustration. Only someone who, under the cover of national interests, is striving to insinuate his own egotistical aspirations and ambitions—only a manifest opponent of perestroyka—could under such conditions criminally encroach on the peace and calm of his people and provoke an interethnic conflict on ground which has historically not known any such conflicts.

Investigations are now being conducted under the strict supervision of the USSR Procuracy and with the participation of representatives of the law enforcement bodies from several union republics. Everything will be determined objectively and the truth will undoubtedly triumph. The interethnic dialogue begun in Abkhazia, the decisiveness of the communists of the oblast party organisation, of all inhabitants of the autonomous republic—Abkhazians, Georgians, Russians, Armenians, Greeks, all of our republic—to overcome the difficulties which have arisen, inspire confidence and optimism about problems not being created in the future for our alliance. [end recording]

Vorotnikov Addresses Plenum

LD1909224989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From feature on work of CPSU Central Committee plenum on 19 September]

[Text] After the first break in the deliberations of the CPSU Central Committee plenum, Comrade Afanasyev, editor-in-chief of the newspaper PRAVDA, spoke. He talked about the need for close cooperation between party officials and the press in the cause of perestroyka.

Then Comrade Vorotnikov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, ascended the rostrum. He said, in part:

[Begin Vorotnikov recording] In the republic, as is known, the public is calling more and more insistently for the formation within the Russian Federation of administrative-government structures similar to those that exist in other union republics, and for enhancement of the status of autonomous formations. The Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation have already submitted to the party's Central Committee, the government, and the Supreme Soviet corresponding proposals for the reestablishment of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, for the setting up of an integrated republican system of material and technical supply, for the formation of a Russian Academy of Sciences, and for the development of the information organs of the press, radio, and television in the RSFSR, as well as a number of other proposals. These measures are essential for the accomplishment of both economic and social tasks.

The problems that have arisen in the field of interethnic relations are not simple in the Russian Federation either. The negative developments taking place in relation to Russians in some republics are giving rise to offence and bewilderment among the public of Russia. Also causing concern are our internal difficulties in resolving the nationalities question. This means, first and foremost: how are we to surmount the injustice committed against the Soviet Germans, Ingushes, Chechens, and a number of other peoples during the Stalin years? How are we to raise the level of the socio-economic development of the ethnic groups of the North, and to extend the rights of the autonomous formations? And it is necessary to adopt a very considerate and thoughtful approach to the resolving of all these problems. One thing is clear: that all these difficult and acute questions have to be tackled bearing in mind the national interests of all the peoples within the framework of our Soviet federation according to the principles of socialism.

In our view, the plenum ought to specify a general procedure for discussing and forming the elements of socio-political structures that are missing in Russia. The draft platform spells out the principal approaches on the subject. They do not give rise to any objections, however. It would be a good idea to think about making them more specific in separate decisions. As is known, the view is being expressed that there is a need to form a Russian organization within the framework of the CPSU. The plenary sessions of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the Komsomol Central Committee considered the need to set up corresponding Russian structures in those organizations too. Obviously, we ought to adopt a definite position on this issue—let's weigh up all the pros and cons—and probably the Central Committee Politburo, perhaps, must...should be instructed to table a proposal for the formation of a Central Committee bureau for the RSFSR and to determine the time for convening a conference of party organizations of the Russian Federation. [end recording]

Prokopyev Addresses Plenum

LD2009022489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From feature on work of CPSU Central Committee plenum on 19 September]

[Text] Then Comrade Prokopyev, first secretary of the CPSU Yakutsk Oblast Committee, spoke. He said in particular:

[Prokopyev] Today in many autonomous republics, concepts of autonomy have outgrown the form in which they were created, and not only local and national issues are being decided. Overall union tasks are being created as well—with union republics—and they are playing a significant role in the overall union division of labor. It seems that there are no obstacles in principle to the formulation of the question of transforming autonomous republics into union republics.

However, at the stage in question, taking into account the political situation and the state of the country's economy, in our view the issue of such an extension of the rights of autonomy so that they [autonomous republics] have the genuine right to be in charge on their territories appears more expedient. In other words the rights of the autonomous republics need to be brought as close as possible to the rights of the union republics.

Indisputably, the most important issue here is the possession and the command over the land, its minerals, and natural resources. This is especially necessary for those republics for which all of this comprises the main source of riches today and for the long-term future. The Yakutsk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic is just such a republic. I support the provision about how the union republic should have the right of posession and command over the land and its minerals.

Kazakh First Secretary Speaks

LD1909225989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From feature on work of CPSU Central Committee plenum on 19 September]

[Text] Comrade Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, devoted a large portion of his speech to the strengthening of friendship between people and the heightening of the role of the CPSU. He said in particular:

[Begin Nazarbayev recording] The Kazakh people asked the Russian people for help and threw their lot in with theirs in the 18th century when the threat of complete annihilation was hanging over them. And although, as in the words of the song, in history you cannot throw out centuries of oppression engendered by the colonial policies of tsarism, our people have not forgotten the support of Russia during the time of the great disaster when the question was to be or not to be the Kazakh

nation. Friendship with Russia is not only our historic past, it today remains a guarantee as well, not only of economic development, but also against those who know of possible encroachments on our land in the future. It would not be a bad thing for everyone to ponder on this. The democracy and glasnost toward which we are all striving so much, should not become the ground for scores to be settled between people, should not break age-old bonds but strengthen them—calling for perestroyka from us. We have reached the point where we are ashamed to pronounce the words friendship, fraternity, motherland, and patriotism. But what is in fashion now? The most extreme, at times, polarized statements of backward conservatism to ultraleft deviations which reject all and everything. Yes, there were Stalinist deformations, no one argues with this any longer, but surely the concept of perestroyka time and again, and it just gives us the real possibility of correcting them. Why is it that some people are more inclined to break things? Surely this must be painful for them? Only harmony, only joint efforts for restoring democracy and the authentic values of socialism are capable of becoming a guarantee of the success of perestroyka. And the CPSU Central Committee should without delay retrieve for itself its consolidating role. Interethnic relations are most subtle and delicate, they will not tolerate any type of voluntarism or pressure. In connection with this, the overall state nationalities policy should be drawn up in a well-defined system of laws. At the very least, we need a law of nationhood and the production of the national dignity of the USSR in which a realistic mechanism for the insurance of this sphere of human relations against all kinds of irresponsible encroachments should be set out.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote that national antipathies will disappear after the definitive establishment of completely democratic relations between peoples. I am sure that the adoption of the new law will have a beneficial effect on the development of the process of a democratization in Soviet society and consequently also on the implementation of these lucid thoughts of Lenin.

And, in conclusion, I would like to address you Mikhail Sergeyevich. However complicated it might be today, whatever difficulties might lie in wait for us on the road to the aims set, people in their absolute majority distinctly understand, we have no alternatives to perestroyka. We either take it to victory, as they say, or we will again return to the dead-end of stagnation. For this reason, the instructions of the communists of Kazakhstan to the CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo is to conduct the planned line decisively. [end recording]

More Speakers Address Plenum

LD1909215889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From feature on work of CPSU Central Committee plenum on 19 September. Speakers included: Potapov, first secretary of the Irkutsk Oblast Party Committee; Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Brazauskas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party; and Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee.]

[Text] Comrade Potapov, first secretary of the Irkutsk Oblast Party Committee, who spoke after Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov, on the whole positively evaluated the party document on interethnic relations but noted that there are half measures in it in relation to the republics of the Russian Federation. Potapov considers that a Russian Communist Party should be reconstituted.

Comrade Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, also spoke. Speaking about the resolution of interethnic problems he noted:

[Begin Nishanov recording] We say fairly that the main knots in interethnic relations which we have to disentangle today were tied in the past. One of these tight knots is the fate of peoples repressed without reason. Decades have passed but justice in relation to them has not been restored. Periodically commissons at various levels have been set up, the right words have been said, but it is just that specific results have not to this time been felt by many peoples. Attempts to resolve the issues of autonomy for Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan and for Soviet Germans in Kazakhstan have not had any success. Comrade Nazarbayev spoke correctly here. Why did they not have any success? Because the leaders of the republics wanted them to, but the people did not want them to. For this reason they had no success. But the years go by and the resolution of these problems becomes more and more complicated. As is well known, the Supreme Soviet has formed commissions on the problems of the Soviet Germans, Meskhetian Turks, and the Crimean Tatars. The commissions are working under complicated conditions and in the near future they must present their proposals for consideration by the Soviet of Nationalities. I do not want to predict their conclusions but I must give my personal opinion. No commission, dear comrades, will be able to do anything while there is no mutually acceptable political decision on these complicated issues and good will from all sides. At the same time we must lead not by emotions but by higher, state considerations. The interested sides must sit down at the negotiations table and, without delays, find solutions to the issue. We became convinced of the fact that no commission will be able to do anything if there is no good will from all sides with the example of the numerous commissions on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. As far as the Soviet Germans,

Crimean Tatars and Meskhatian Turks are concerned, they are persistently and stubbornly trying to attain the right to live in the places from which they were inhumanly removed. [end recording]

The speech by Comrade Brazauskas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, was constructive. Touching on the situation in the republic to start off with, he said:

[Begin Brazauskas recording] the communist party of Lithuania is at the center of political life, as well as the public informal movement Sajudis. And interethnic relations are to a decisive extent determining the direction and polarity of the processes taking place in Lithuania. At the same time, glasnost and democratization have made it possible for a large number of informal organizations of various trends to come out into the political arena. Some of them have called themselves parties. More often than not, they advance extremely categorical slogans and carry out actions on which the attention of people visiting the republic is frequently focussed. In our republic these forces do not as a rule enjoy special support. Therefore the stands taken by the central mass media which make sweeping generalizations and conclusions based on individual facts and form public opinion on the basis of this are unacceptable and do not serve to strengthen mutual understanding among peoples.

The Communist Party of Lithuania is making its way into people's awareness through a thick layer of distrust which has very deep historical roots and serious social and economic grounds. The trust of the masses can only be gained by profoundly fathoming the aspirations of the people, by radical and resolute political steps. Therefore, the first meaning of the customary slogan "the party's plan is the people's plan" sounds different today—"the people's plan is the party's plan". It is supported by the people since this is not simply a rearrangement of words. The communists of Lithuania understand very well that management in the new conditions can only be affected when one is profoundly aware of the processes taking place, of people's interests, and one has a precise idea of ways of finding a solution and receives a mandate to effect such leadership. It is no secret that there are forces in the republic for whom independence and sovereignty are connected with secession from the Soviet Union. One cannot ignore these forces. Our position, however, like the position of all judicious people in the republic, is a single-minded one, that Lithuania is so integrated into the union's economy, has such political, cultural and simply human ties, that a rupture in them would be ruinous. The Lithuanian people want friendly relations with equal rights with our immediate neighbors, the Russians, the Belorussians, the Latvians, and others. We think that in today's world there are not and cannot be isolated, absolutely independent states and peoples. [end recording]

A considerable proportion of the address by Comrade Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, was devoted to an analysis of the situation which has arisen in the republic in the past few days.

[Begin Grossu recording] The situation in our republic remains complicated. Extremist attacks and nationalistic and chauvinistic manifestations of an anti-Russian and anti-Moldavian nature are taking place.

Individual leaders of independent movements and associations are attempting to use democratization and glasnost for consolidating selfish and group interests, are proclaiming antisocialist slogans, are pushing people onto the unlawful path of anarchy and disorder, and are calling for the creation of alternative structures of power.

Tensions became especially exacerbated on the eve of the 13th session of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet, which was convened to examine the laws regarding language. In the run-up to this, meetings became more frequent and their scale broadened substantially. In a number of large towns politically motivated general strikes broke out. Ultimatums and unlawful demands started to be issued to the government and the confrontation of people on the basis of ethnic criteria started to deepen and widen.

To all this the republic's Communist Party Central Committee reacted in a most direct way. Direct contacts with people in labor collectives and at meetings were established. Meetings were conducted with the leaders of informal organizations and strike committees.

Appeals were adopted to communists, workers, and engineering and technical staff of striking enterprises were adopted. In primary party organizations assemblies were held. Sessions of local soviet and citizens' meetings took place.

But here is what I would like to note in this connection: the splashes of negative emotions on an ethnic basis are the result by no means only of the adoption of laws regarding language which, by the way, in proclaiming the Moldavian language the state language and Russian the language of interethnic relations in the republic's territory do not discriminate in any away against people of other nationalities. We fully support the concept set out in the report on giving the Russian language a status of statewide importance.

However, the sources and first causes of these splashes go substantially deeper. They lie in the consequences of the arbitrary rule and lawlessness of the times of Stalinism, (?in) the deformation of national development in the period, in economic difficulties, and other very acute social questions. [end recording]

Speakers Continue To Discuss Ethnic Issues

LD1909222589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From feature on work of CPSU Central Committee plenum on 19 September. Speakers at the rostrum included: Khabibullin, first secretary of the Bashkir CPSU obkom; Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; Masaliyev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Kirgiz Communist Party; Yelchenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; Karabasov, secretary of the CPSU Moscow city committee; Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee; and Zavgayev, first secretary of the Chechen-Ingush Oblast Party Committee.]

[Text] The debate on the report was opened by comrade Khabibullin, first secretary of the Bashkir CPSU obkom. He said that the Bashkir Communists support the CPSU Central Committee platform on the nationalities issue, but consider it necessary to make considerable corrections to the draft:

[Begin Khabibullin recording] We consider that the Central Committee draft platform does not contain any breakthrough from established views, preserving inviolate the hierarchical structure of the national and state set-up. They fail to take full account of the profound socio-economic and cultural developments that have taken place in the autonomous republics. Let's look at the Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic as an example. If we take it hypothetically as one of the union republics, it holds sixth place among them in its volume of aggregate social product. In other words, while surpassing the majority of union republics in its volume of national income and per capita industrial output, Bashkiria is nevertheless lagging incomparably behind them in its social development.

You can judge this for yourselves. Among the 73 oblasts, krays, and autonomous republics of the Russian Federation—which, incidentally, is not one of the leaders either—Bakhkira comes between 40th and 60th as regards the major social indicators. The reason such injustice has come about is that 97 percent of the industrial enterprises in the multibranch industrial potential created on Bashkir territory are on union or union-republic subordination, while only 3 percent are of local subordination. It is these 3 percent that provide almost 90 percent of our republic's budget. Autonomous status creates literally insurmountable barriers to solving issues concerning national culture. By way of example, Estonia's population is 2 and ½ times smaller than Bashkira's, but 105 journals and other periodicals are published there, while we have only 10. And where per capita publication of books is concerned we have 28 times fewer than our Estonian comrades. The oblast party organization, consisting of 230,000 communists, still does not have its own theoretical journal, though the matter has been repeatedly raised with the Central Committee. The center has given Bashkir local television permission to broadcast for only 3 hours, whereas the union republics have many times more hours. The republic has no film studio of its own. Given these conditions can one hope to satisfy the requirments of a multi-ethnic population through the mass media?

The unequal legal status also infringes the political rights of the autonomous peoples. Thus Bashkiria, with a population of 4 million, is represented in the country's highest organ of state power by far fewer deputies than a number of union republics with a substantially smaller population.

This, whichever sphere one takes, whether socio-economic, political, ideological, or cultural, one comes up everywhere against the restrictions in the existing structure of the federation. This inevitably gives rise to friction in inter-ethnic relations and devalues the party's nationalities policy at the local level. [end recording]

Comrade Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, singled out, in his speech, an issue which he considers fundamental:

[Begin Sokolov recording] Nor does there seem to be much precision in the interpretation of the economic substance of self- determination and sovereignty as the adoption of financial autonomy and self-financing by the republics. The major problem here is the right of ownership of land, the subsoil, forest, water and other natural riches and resources. Is there not some incompleteness or imprecision in the draft's provisions where natural riches are assigned to the republics, while the union is given the right to determine the all-union basis for their utilization? For it cannot be ruled out that the center, in the person of ministries and departments, might determine a basis that would turn the republics's rights into empty formalities. Furthermore, this provision means that neither the republics nor the union possess the triad of powers—ownership, control and utilization—that constitutes the rights of property.

I see the approach to this problem somewhat differently: in a genuinely democratic law-governed federative state—which is that we are aspiring toward—strategic elements such as the ownership and control of natural resources should belong to the sphere of joint competence of both the union and the republics. At the same time, I believe that the USSR Supreme Soviet should uneqivocally define the degree to which republican property is autonomous in respect of union property. It is for the republics' supreme soviets to define the degree of independence of oblast property from republican property, while the oblast soviets will do this as regards town and rayon property. [end recording]

The next speaker in the debate was Comrade Masaliyev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Kirgiz Communist Party. He spoke about the republic's social and economic problems and mentioned in his speech the activities of certain informal organizations:

[Begin Masaliyev recording] It is with alarm and anguish that the Kirgistan working people are following the development of events in the Soviet Baltic republics, of which the CPSU Central Committee statement spoke in a concerned and principled way. Tension remains in certain regions as well. The leaders of many popular fronts and movements are adopting a disreputable stance. It is time, in this connection, Mikhail Sergeyevich, comrade members of the Politburo, to express a clear and firm view on such formations and unions, and to call to order those who are now speaking openly against our system and our unity, who are sabotaging the perestroyka and abusing democracy. [applause] [end recording]

The floor was given to Comrade Yelchenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

[Begin Yelchenko recording] While supporting the idea of state recognition of the national languages in the republics, we are unreservedly in favor of further developing the Russian language—the language of interethnic communication, which has, in effect, become the statewide language—and of ensuring legal and actual equality between the Ukrainian and Russian languages, as well as of the languages of all the other nationalities represented in the republic's population. The debate on the draft law on languages of the Ukrainian SSR, which was published at the beginning of September of this year and which reflects this principled attitude, shows that the intelligentsia, workers, collective farm workers, and representatives of all nations and ethnic groups on the whole support it. [end recording]

Comrade Karabasov, secretary of the CPSU Moscow city committee, came to the rostrum:

[Begin Karabasov recording] We are returning to Lenin's practice in the development of interethnic relations. At present there are nine city national cultural societies in Moscow and several more public formations will acquire such status in the near future. In addition, there is a whole series of national-cultural organizations functioning on the rayon level. More than 40 optional inter-school courses for learning the languages of the peoples of the USSR have opened in Moscow, a center for national cinema has begun functioning, and cultural and trade centers for the union republics are already being set up, though slowly. But these, of course, are merely the first steps.

One particular problem is the rebirth of Moscow as the spiritual and not only administrative center of the Russian Federation. We understand the concern felt over this by a number of oblast party committees which have expressed their proposals on the CPSU draft platform on nationalities policy, and these are contained in the materials distributed at the plenum. We support the proposal that the autonomous republics, oblasts and districts of the Russian Federation need permanent representations in Moscow. Along with the union republican representations, which life has already pointed in the direction of social policy problems as well, the representations of all the autonomous structures would make a contribution toward reinforcing the friendship of the peoples, developing internationalism, and consolidating our socialist federation. [end recording]

Comrade Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee, highly appraised the party's draft platform on the nationalities question and proposed that it should be adopted as a basis:

[Begin Niyazov recording] Today, in my view, in a number of places the growth in national self-awareness has become a factor which promotes not the rapprochement but the separation of peoples. Against the background of our foreign policy and its direction of affirming values common to all mankind, the state of affairs in the native homeland looks at least a paradox. The communality of the historic fates of our peoples; the considerable years of joint work, victories and shocks; and the economic potential of the republic created by the common efforts of all peoples, cannot and should not be sacrificed for somebody's ambitions. I think it essential to state—and this is the position of the communists and the whole of the population of the Turkmen SSR—our loyalty to the decision adopted in 1924 to join the composition of the USSR and firm conviction that only with the framework of the Soviet Federation is the correct resolving possible of political, economic, and national problems which stand before us. It seems that the CPSU's principled position on this question could be clearly and unambiguously expressed in a decision of this plenum and the party platform on the nationalities question. [end recording]

Comrade Zavgayev, first secretary of the Chechen-Ingush Oblast Party Committee, ended the discussion on the first day of the CPSU Central Committee plenum. In particular he expressed doubts about the rapidity of declaring state languages in the republics, which in his view exacerbates interethnic relations. comrade Zavgayev thinks that gradualness is needed in everything, while the language of business papers has never promoted the development of and preservation of national cultures.

An Editorial Commission has been formed at the plenum to do additional work on the CPSU's draft platform, "The Party's nationalities Policy in Contemporary Conditions," and to prepare a decision of the plenum on the matter discussed.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum will continue on 20 September.

Correction to Report on 19 Sep Proceedings

LD1909183189

Moscow TASS in English at 1745 GMT on 19 September retransmits the item which appeared as 'Plenum Continues Work' on page 43 of the 19 September Soviet

Union DAILY REPORT. Better reception of the retransmission allows the following correction to be made:

Paragraph six, only sentence should read: "...of the party's draft platform by party committees, communists, state and..." (supplying indistinct words)

Sakharov Sees Possibility of Military Coup

LD1909180589 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1411 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Paris, Sept 19 (TANJUG)—Academician Andrey Sakharov, until recently a leading personality among Soviet dissdents, does not exclude the possibility of violent change in the leadership of the Soviet Union. He, however, believes that "Gorbachev is not threatened from the immediate vicinity."

Sakharov believes that the change in Kremlin could be performed as a "military coup, or in another way."

In a statement to the France-Presse news agency, Sakharov warned about the danger of an action of the "right wing which reflects the interests of the bureaucratic oligarchy in the (?Soviet) party." Such an action, in his view, would not have the support of the Kremlin leadership, since "Gorbachev dominates these circles."

Sakharov especially pointed out the danger arising from the current ethnic clashes in the Soviet Union, saying that their scope is a "result of a bad, short-sighted and irresolute policy of the centre," which systematically lags behind in reaching the right and necessary decisions.

USSR Supreme Soviet Committees Begin Work

LD1909185189 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The USSR Supreme Soviet's committees and the commissions of its chambers, the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities, have started discussion of the documents submitted for the Soviet parliament's second session, due to open in the Kremlin on September 25.

In its first weeks the session will pay principal attention to the draft state plan and budget estimates for 1990. These documents were forwarded by the Soviet Government to parliament on September 1.

A thorough study of these drafts in the committees and commissions with the participation of government representatives and prominent experts will help avoid long debates at joint meetings of the chambers and thereby make the parliament's autumn session more efficient. This is very important since the agenda includes many bills which also need to be closely studied.

Many committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the commissions of the chambers therefore today started the discussion of the draft state plan and budget estimates. Their social aspects became a subject of discussion at the meeting of the Council of the Union's Standing Commission on Labour, Prices and Social Policy.

The deputies were addressed by senior officials of the relevant departments of the USSR State Planning Committee, who commented on the main provisions of the documents.

The national income share for consumption and nonproductive construction will amount to 86 percent next year as against 83.7 in 1989, it was noted at the meeting. Expenditures for enlarged reproduction will be curtailed by 17.7 percent. The output of consumer goods will increase by 6.7 percent with a very modest, 0.5 percent on average, rise in production of the means of production.

Critical remarks were made in the course of the discussion. Some commission members doubted that social development figures in the Plan would enable a fundamental improvement in the state of affairs and proposed to considerably increase them. It was also suggested to include in the plan indicators of satisfaction of solvent demand and plan real incomes by separate social groups.

The USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee on Construction and Architecture plans to focus attention on the pattern of capital investments in construction. To study this complex problem in detail the deputies will hear next week reports by senior officials of the USSR State Planning Committee and the State Committee for Construction and also construction ministries and departments.

Supreme Soviet Press Center Head Describes Job

LD1909122289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0700 GMT on 19 September broadcasts a 4-minute interview with Arkadiy Afrikanovich Maslennikov, head of the press center at the USSR Supreme Soviet, by Correspondent Olga Vasilenko.

Maslennikov begins by providing some details of his career. He is a professional journalist, having worked on PRAVDA for 24 years. As head of the press center, it is his job to help journalists obtain information about the work of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies, and to organize briefings and press conferences, guided by the decision adopted at the last Supreme Soviet session with regard to work and cooperation with the press.

Vasilenko asks: "To return to that decision, there is a clause in it stating that any journalist who violates journalistic ethics will not be permitted to work. What is meant by this."

Maslennikov replies: "Well, first, I do not think we will have to apply this clause of decision, which refers to the

possibility of depriving journalists of their accreditation because of distortion or incorrect coverage of the work of the Supreme Soviet and its session, and the working organs and people's deputies. What it refers to, though, is this: There are occasions, for example, when a statement or action is attributed to a people's deputy or a committee which they did not utter or commit. This is merely a question of journalistic and human ethics. We will be chatting to people and helping them to get their bearings."

Vasilenko say: "But you know, we most likely will be giving various points of view from one deputy, from a second, and a third, and so on. Might not there be some things cropping up here which, so to speak, may not be to the liking of the press center, or the apparatus of the Supreme..."

Maslennikov interrupts her, replying: "No, the press center has no sympathies or antipathies or anything of the sort. We do, indeed, expect that you will give the entire diversity of opinions, views, and experience the people's deputies bring with them. Furthermore, we will make efforts to enable you to show precisely the most diverse views and those aspects of the work of the Supreme Soviet and its organs which are hidden from the public eye. What I have in mind here, in particular, is the work on drawing up legislation in committees and commissions, and individual deputies." What is not permissible, Maslennikov reiterates, is when individuals or committees are cited to have made some pronouncement or come to some decision which they have not, in fact, done. Vasilenko recalls that the draft law on the press currently under discussion will be of assistance in this regard.

Vasilenko asks: "Another question: We have a very large number of letters and telephone calls asking whether the session and the congress will be broadcast, at least in recorded form."

Maslennikov says: "The final decision indisputably lies with the deputies as to the degree to which, and in what form they want their discussion to be made public. As far as I know, at the present stage the deputies have expressed themselves in favor of keeping the existing system, that is, recordings in the evening when people are free from their main work, so that people can directly, immediately, and personally learn what is being said here, and either watch or listen. This is very important now, in the process of democratization and glasnost which we are all now living through."

CPSU Lacks Procudures for Resignation

18001611 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Sep 89 p 2

[Article by G. Belotserkovskiy: "To Leave the Ranks"]

[Text]**Karaganda—The system for admission into the party is regulated by the CPSU Charter. There is not a word on voluntary departure from the party. It seems as if there would never be a question of it. And unwittingly, you think about it: Are there any unwritten laws on this score? It seems as if there are not. True, under Stalin, no one would have considered self-exclusion; one was more likely to put a gun to one's head. Later, under Khrushchev and Brezhnev, such a step could also end sadly.**

Times are different now. Many taboos have been broken, including the one against self-initiated departure from the CPSU.

A. Tarabanov held prominent posts in the Karaganda metallurgy combine. But the time came for him to rest. Upon petitioning the combine's "triad," he received a republic-list pension. Former combine Director A. Akbiyev created a sinecure position especially for Tarabanov—assistant chief for commercial production. But there was no commerce, meaning that this was a cushy position. It was just recently eliminated. Our hero put his party card on the table and said, "What good does this do me now?"

"Last year, we had 24 people leave the party," says V. Volovik, the combine's partkom [party committee] deputy secretary. "This year, it's already up to about 50, primarily people like Tarabanov. They were in too much of a hurry to admit them, just to report on growth in the ranks. They were called to strict account for that. But why? Swelling the party is an absurd goal. But now there are other directives: nobody has to be dragged into the party kicking and screaming. But no, they call from the obkom [oblast committee]: They're not just admitting people! There's hardly anybody they won't accept!"

That's for sure. Former foreman G. Timanov left the CPSU simply because they eliminated his position at his sector, and he was back among the workers. But in the next sector, a non-party foreman remained in his position. "What good is a party that doesn't take care of its cadres?" inquired Timanov.

And V. Kozhevnikov, deputy director of a shop at the Irtysh chemical-metallurgical plant, while turning in his party candidates' card explained, "Now even a non-party member may manage." Of course, he can be condemned for such a mercenary approach to the party card. But it seems much more important to condemn the system under which making a purely professional career was possible only upon entering a political party.

But there are other facts as well. It resounded in ceremonious tones at a Karaganda Oblast party aktiv that one V. Zhasanov, former party buro deputy secretary of the coking shop at the aforementioned metallurgy combine, had left the party. You see, he was not in agreement with the party's course toward democratization and glasnost.

The audience rejoiced: one more Stalinist had waved the white flag. But it rejoiced in vain...

"I am hardly opposed to perestroyka," Vladimir Zhasanov, a nice, strapping young Ukrainian, told me. "I protested several of its obvious extremes, for example,

the struggle against drunkenness. This is preposterous; sugar has disappeared, and we have spawned moonshiners, drug addicts, and speculators."

I was told only the nicest thing about him, that he was a metal worker with golden hands, well-disciplined, a fine comrade and family man. And there you have it—to have thought up such a thing. People dissuaded him for a long time. His wife even intimidated him with a divorce; she was afraid that it would have repercussions in her life as well as his. But Vladimir stood firm; times are different... True, at the meeting, they flung offensive words at him—coward, deserter, traitor. One old man came shaking all over and said, "Under Stalin, you would have been packed off to prison within 12 hours." But Zhasanov was not sent anywhere. He was simply excluded for "failure to comprehend the current political situation."

I spoke with him for quite some time, trying to get down to the truth; I did not believe that the extremes in the struggle with the "damned" were the main arguments. I spoke about how such extremes had already been labeled extremes, and that in general, such weighty decisions were not made on the cell level—The Supreme Soviet, the people's deputies judge every letter...

"That could be," he replied. But in general, to be honest, we party members lead a boring life; everything is empty discussion at the meetings. Everybody can see that our administration does not respond even to the partkom secretary. It pursues its own policy no matter what: All for the plan; nothing for people. But what about rank-and-file communists? Why am I in the party if my voice cannot be heard?"

All of this would seem to be true. Vladimir told me about how he became a communist. He was then a Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] committee secretary in a virgin lands sovkhoz [state farm]. So the partkom secretary forcibly drags him into the party. "We desperately need you, Volodya, a Komsomol leader, in the party. There is a kind of directive. Now, don't be scared; it will come in useful in life..."

Everything led up to this history. Zhasanov did not strike the obkom party aktiv secretary as a reactionary person. He was simply a person accidentally in the party, who did not know what it meant to him or why it needed him...

V. Andryushin, an instructor at the Karaganda Obkom, told me that Kazakhstan's "Magnitogorsk Combine" holds the record for the number of self-initiated departures from the CPSU. And the influx has fallen sharply. Party admission is basically as it was of old—from the Komsomol and trade union activists. How can this order be broken? It was recommended that in every "primary" organization there be created a group of five or six old party members, to study the party resources, to seek out change. We want to regenerate the former spirit of party comradeship.

Of the 64 Karaganda residents who turned in their party cards, 14 are pensioners who have done a great deal for the country and the party. They write in the announcements all the more frequently, "We are ill, we cannot come to the meetings; thus you may exclude us..." There are also many veterans, who must be excluded grudgingly, against their will. And what is to be done if the Charter's paragraph is to be interpreted simply: If you do not work in the party, leave it. How many deep, unhealed wounds have been inflicted upon wonderful people. I remember how afraid my grandfather was—he was over 80, active in the revolution—to miss even a single meeting. He feared the shame of exclusion. But he did not have the strength to carry out commissions, or to simply travel anywhere. I frequently wonder that if he had missed a few meetings, and not been so tormented in our miserable buses, who knows, perhaps he would have lived a little longer?

Does such a concept as mercy enter into the party charter? For our elderly, for our invalids?

"We hope very much that it does," I was told at the Communist Party of Kazakhstan's Central Committee. "These people must be CPSU members in good standing, with the right not to attend meetings and not to pay membership dues. I think that we will present that proposal to the regular Congress..."

Those who have excluded themselves, by the very fact of their appearance, have raised many problems, both moral ones and ones within the charter. These facts have to be studied; no one should pretend that nothing is happening. And in any case, the scale of the phenomenon should not be underestimated, as was done in the Karaganda Obkom, where there was one document for internal use, and another, with sharply reduced figures, for the Central Committee. If we take into consideration that the motives of those who exclude themselves are distorted once more to suit the purposes of the same "party authority," then there is a danger that once again, the correct conclusions will not be reached because of a broken bureaucratic telephone "at the top."

You cannot set a correct course with a broken compass. Without understanding why people leave the party, without speaking with them confidentially, without fear, you will not perceive the many sore points in the party mechanism. But in order that the fear may disappear, a de jure, chartered, and legal line is needed that guarantees people: You have the right to freely leave the party, with complete social protection after that step.

Contents of IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS No 9 Noted

LD1809195489 Moscow TASS in English 1936 GMT 18 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 18 TASS—The ninth issue of the journal "IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS" (The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee News) came off the press. The issue opens with a report about the work of the party's Central Committee in August 1989. New

decisions of the Politburo and Secretariat of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee are published.

The journal gives the profiles of first secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of union republics, of territorial, regional and district committees of the party and also carries brief biographies of first secretaries who are not in the leading elective bodies of the Soviet Communist Party.

Documents of the commission of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo for further studies of materials connected with repressions of the 30s-40s and early 50s deal with the so-called parallel anti-Soviet Trotskyite centre. In answer to a reader's request it is reported that materials on the case of the so-called "Leningrad centre" to whose members Sergey Kirov's assassination was incriminated are investigated at present.

What is party functionaries' opinion of perestroyka in the party? This can be learned from excerpts from protocols of plenums of party committees carried in the news section. The journal carries reports about the elections and endorsement of party officials.

The issue contains various items prepared on readers' requests. They include answers to questions about the growth of the party membership in 1970-1984, about how party membership dues are expended, about the destiny of Marshal G.I. Kulik, about the life-path of leader of the party of left socialist revolutionaries Maria Spiridonova. Published are documents of the 30s showing who had made the decision to demolish the Sukharev tower in Moscow and in what way this decision was taken.

Letters from readers suggested a new section "photographs from the archive". Published in this section are rare photographs from the past, including a number of photographs of Lenin which were printed in an incomplete or distorted form for years.

The mailbag contains the analysis of letters and verbal addresses of citizens to the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee in the first six months of 1989. There is information about the setting up of the Bulgakov Centre in Moscow. The journal received as many as 2,146 letters over the last eight months. The issue carries a review of the mailbag, readers' wishes, remarks and suggestions and sums up plans for publication of various materials.

The archive section of the journal publishes for the first time the minutes of the closed-door meetings of the eighth congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) at which questions of the military policy were discussed.

Armenian Fuel Reserves Reportedly Depleted

LD2009053289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Here is a report from Armenia. The fuel reserves are fully exhausted at the storage tanks of Yerevan's Zvartnots Airport. As has been reported by the Armenian Administration of Civil Aviation, 12 flights to various cities in the country were delayed during the first half of 19 September. Many passengers are being forced to exchange their tickets. Urgent business trips are being cancelled. The delivery to Armenia of groups of construction workers occupied in the restoration works in the disaster zone is being thwarted. There is only one reason for this: rolling-stock with fuel and other freight is being delayed, as previously, in the sidings of the Azerbaijan railway.

Vezirov's Remarks 'Infuriate' Armenians

NC1909174289 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0900 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Excerpts] During recent weeks, when the inflow of freight via the railways has come to a halt, thanks to the Azerbaijanis, and the blockade of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and Armenia has (?rendered) many labor collectives (?idle), the statement by Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, on central television's "Vremya" program was strange, to say the least, and infuriating.

To talk about the brotherhood of peoples under such conditions, while he is uprooting this people whom he describes as fraternal from Kirovabad and other areas by the most (?evil) means, is simply shameful and brings no honor to the leader of the neighbouring republic. Already, as a result of the blockade, many enterprises and construction organizations in Yerevan and elsewhere in the republic face serious difficulties because they cannot obtain the materials they need. Yet he made no reference to this at all. [passage indistinct]. We hope that measures will be taken to consign the blockade to history; a history, however, which will never be forgotten. Also never to be forgotten is Vezirov's statement, which is a rhetoric of (?lies). [passage omitted]

The workers of Gorisskiy rayon are extremely indignant at Vezirov's remarks on the "Vremya" program. The whole world has sent in aid for the construction of houses for the [word indistinct] and homeless of the disaster area, but Azerbaijan has blockaded Armenia. (Robert Aleksanyan), first secretary of the Gorisskiy rayon committee and deputy at the republic's supreme soviet,said this. Remarks such as these by the secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee do not befit a communist and [word indistinct]. I strongly condemn his stance and express my indignation at that statement, he added. [passage omitted]

The CPSU plenum devoted to the nationalities problem opens today in Moscow. This is a long awaited event,

taking place at a time when Armenia and the NKAO are under blockade. We have often read and heard about the blockade of Leningrad by the fascist armies and how our army restored the city's lifeline at the cost of grave sacrifices and losses. Today we have no war, but there is a blockade imposed by a 70-year-old fraternal republic. After a long silence on the blockade, PRAVDA today devoted a small corner to it. However, the papers of our republic, instead of publishing the usual warm greetings to the plenum, have published angry words. The people are expressing their rage even through the radio so that they can be heard. Alas! Who will listen? Again, we talk and it is we who listen to what we are saying. [passage omitted].

Azerbaijan Government Debates Economy, NKAO

PM1909153789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Z. Kadymbekov report: "First Session Documents"]

[Text] An extraordinary session of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet discussed the republic's Council of Ministers report "On Progress in Implementing Socioeconomic Plans Aimed at Boosting the Living Standards of the Republic's Population." A report on this issue was delivered by A. Mutalibov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers.

It was noted that, as a whole, the profits plan for the national economy has been overfulfilled. Labor productivity increased by 6.4 percent. The number of loss-making enterprises almost halved compared with last year. As a result of these positive improvements Azerbaijan is already ensuring income from its budget without union subsidies before the transition to self-financing.

At the same time, a great deal of what was envisaged in the plans has not been implemented. This is a result of the situation prevailing as a result of interethnic tension. Owing to the strikes in 1988-1989 there was a shortfall of almost R390 million in industrial output, R208 million of which was accounted for by the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO].

The arguments that have flared up around the discussion of the questions of sovereignty, economic independence, the republic's transition to economic accountability, and the situation in the NKAO continued after midnight. At the end of the first day the session, which will be continued in a few days' time, adopted an Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet resolution on the draft concept and law "On the Economic Independence of the Azerbaijan SSR and Its Transition to Economic Accountability and Self-Financing." A resolution on the situation in the Azerbaijan SSR's NKAO was adopted which envisages appealing to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to repeal its decision to set up a Special Administration Committee in the oblast on the grounds that it was unjustified.

Other acts of legislation were also ratified.

Azerbaijan Terms NKAO Council 'Unconstitutional'

PM2009083189 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 27 Aug 89 p 1

["Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) Supreme Soviet Presidium Resolution on Unconstitutional Act in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO)"—BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY headline]

[Text] On 16 August 1989 in Stepanakert there was a "congress of plenipotentiary representatives of the NKAO population," which declared the oblast an "independent union territory" in which the Azerbaijan SSR Constitution and other republican laws have been suspended. The "congress" was not attended by representatives of the Azerbaijani and other nationalities inhabiting the oblast. The "congress" set up a "national council," which was declared the sole people's power in the NKAO, which is effectively an attempt to strip the Special Administration Committee of its authority.

All this, together with the unprecedented statement on the transfer of all power in the NKAO to the "national council," is an infringement of state power and yet another anticonstitutional venture by nationalist, separatist forces that are deliberately engaging in illegal actions, even to the point of usurping authority.

The Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees:

1. That the decisions of the so-called "congress" be deemed illegal and the creation in the NKAO of a "national council" whose aims and tasks are geared to further fueling interethnic enmity and wresting the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh from the Azerbaijan SSR be deemed unconstitutional.

2. That it be brought to the attention of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium that the "congress" unlawfully declared the NKAO Special Administration Committee, set up by decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on 12 January 1989, to be illegal.

[Signed] E. Kafarova, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
R. Kaziyeva, secretary of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
Baku, 26 August 1989.

Official Says NKAO Republic Issue

PM1909124389 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 26 Aug 89 p 2

[Article by A. Ibragimov, chief of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium Legal Department, under the rubric "Nationalities Policy: Discussing the CPSU Draft Platform": "Democratic Center and Sovereign Republics"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] There were many questions about the paragraph in the chapter entitled "The Nationalities Question And Civil Rights" which talks of the

need to take all the necessary steps to solve the problems and lists the peoples who suffered under Stalin. Top of the list was the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. It is hard to imagine what the compilers of the list meant when talking about the Karabakh issue. It seems to me that it has been created artificially, deliberately by the opponents of perestroyka and with the backing of international reaction. Over a period of 18 months this question has been discussed at all party and state levels. All the decisions unequivocally state that the demand for the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic's NKAO to join Armenia is absurd and could lead to unpredictable consequences, which is what happened as a result of the brazen actions of the Armenian extremists. The expulsion of Azerbaijanis from Armenia, the killing of innocent people, the oppression of Azerbaijanis in the oblast itself, and the numerous, unceasing interethnic conflicts to the point where the Azerbaijani intelligentsia and Azerbaijani citizens made a firm decision to resurrect their sovereignty on the territory of the NKAO. The union's measures amounted to repeated discussion and introduction of the Special Administration Committee and they did not bear fruit. I believe that the people, given strict observance of Soviet laws and respect for other nations and ethnic groups, by means of ensuring the safety of citizens, irrespective of nationality, and with the help of the party, soviet, and public organizations of the Soviet Union and USSR citizens, are capable of safeguarding their sovereignty on the entire territory of the republic, including the NKAO. The intelligentsia has spoken, the people are setting up committees to aid Karabakh, and the question of calling criminals of all stripes to account has been raised. I believe that Karabakh is a question of our republic's sovereignty and not a union problem.

For all the shortcomings of today's draft, the discussion and finalization of the platform and its future consolidation by acts of legislation will mean that every citizen will feel that he is master in his own country.

'Hypocritical' Report on NKAO Hit

PM1909145589 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 26 Aug 89 p 3

[AZERINFORM report: "In the Guise of Objectivity. Concerning a Report"]

[Text] It is now a bad rule that reports from Stepanakert under the standard headline "On Events In Nagorno-Karabakh" are biased and subjective. But a report under that headline published in the central papers the other day is stunningly hypocritical. On the one hand, they timidly report that all labor activity in the oblast had been essentially paralyzed since 3 May, then they relate cheerfully and in great detail the fact that last week's Stepanakert congress of plenipotentiary representatives of the populace of Nagorno-Karabakh had adopted a decision on restoring the work rhythm all over the oblast's territory. The authors were simply not interested in what had prevented the oblast's enterprises from operating in May, June, July, and August and what money the strikers were living on.

Furthermore, apparently, in the opinion of the congress, the introduction of the special form of administration in the oblast contradicts the CPSU Statutes and is unconstitutional.

In recent months we have heard, read, and seen plenty of things that contradict the CPSU Statutes, laws, and the Constitution. The congress of plenipotentiary representatives of the populace of Nagorno-Karabakh and the election of its national council, which wants to dominate the running of the oblast in all spheres, are another attack on the republic's sovereignty. It is time this newcomer and the other nationalist councils, anti-Soviets, and the envoys of the Armenian diaspora realized once and for all that the party has made it clear that national borders cannot be redrawn. And no matter how much certain people dislike this, they will have to finally accept it. And the sooner the better.

It is hard to understand the writers of the report, who describe the congress in such detail, while interspersing obviously naive questions, such as "it is unclear how relations will be established between the council and the Special Administration Committee," and stressing that the national council is independent in its activity and accountable only to the congress.

But what kind of a statement is this!

"The lawyers have yet to give their assessments of the legality of the congress and say whether its documents accord with state legislation, in view of the form of special administration that exists in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]." And what about the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Constitution? Clearly the authors did not address this question. Instead, they reassure us that "the leaders of the Armenian part of the Nagorno-Karabakh population are seeking effective new ways of actively expressing their will."

Such actions by the Stepanakert leaders, totally ignoring the interests and rights of the Azerbaijani population of the NKAO, compounded by covert support in the press in the guise of objectivity, can do nothing but harm.

NKAO Committee Views Troop Presence

PM1909125989 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 26 Aug 89 p 2

[Reprint of Nagorno-Karabakh Special Administration Committee address "To the Population of Nagorno-Karabakh" from 22 August 1989 SOVETSKIY KARABAKH carried under the "Attention!" rubric]

[Text] Rumors are circulating in the city of Yerevan citing officials from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] Special Administration Committee regarding the supposedly impending withdrawal of troop units from the NKAO.

In this connection the editorial office is reprinting the address from the Special Administration Committee to the population of NKAO published in SOVETSKIY KARABAKH for 22 August 1989.

Among certain individuals of both Armenian and Azerbaijan nationality there has recently been a marked increase in manifestations of dissatisfaction at the presence of internal troop subunits in the region and an increase in the frequency of cases of insubordination on the part of citizens toward the troop and militia detachments which are performing their crucial duties of safeguarding people and preventing mass clashes and other disturbances on an interethnic basis. There have been frequent attacks on servicemen.

For instance, a sentry guarding a militia subunit's quarters was attacked 13 August in the settlement of Ballydzha. On the same day two citizens in a drunken state incited the population to illegal actions and yelled nationalist slogans. On being arrested, they put up vigorous resistance to the troop detachment. On the night of 13-14 August the driver of an automobile secretly transporting munitions refused to obey a signal to halt at an entry checkpoint in Shushinskiy Rayon and attempted to pass without examination.

Attacks are continuing on motorized convoys, along with bombardments of entry checkpoints. Troop detachments are forced to use special equipment and to fire warning shots. An official vehicle carrying law-enforcement workers escorted by servicemen was attacked 16 August on the highway to Shusha. It was only possible to disperse the crowds by firing shots into the air. On the night of 16-17 August unknown persons tried to set fire to a combat vehicle with petrol bombs at an entry checkpoint in Martuninskiy Rayon.

Insults directed at servicemen, whom unscrupulous people call occupiers, are heard increasingly frequently at unsanctioned rallies and other meetings in Stepanakert, Shusha, and other population centers in the special area, while demands are voiced for the troops to be withdrawn from the region. A number of Armenian and Azerbaijan activists have made unworthy attacks on servicemen.

All this arouses legitimate perplexity among soldiers and officers and causes them to doubt the advisability of their presence here.

According to the Special Administration Committee and the military commandant the question of the withdrawal of troops from Nagorno-Karabakh put to the USSR Supreme Soviet commission by the leaders of informal associations is premature and dangerous in this situation. It can only be decided with consideration for the opinion of the entire population in the special area. At the same time we believe that these and other similar provocative statements are designed exclusively to destabilize the situation and aim to unleash fratricidal war.

Servicemen have no task apart from ensuring peace and order in the region and preventing the death of women, old people, and children. This crucial mission has to be fulfilled under the most difficult conditions. As is well known, many officers have already been living away from their families for more than 1 year and soldiers do not receive leave passes. At any time of the day they are ready to extinguish seats of conflict throughout the autonomous oblast. Some subunits live in Stepanakert, while working in the oblast. That is quite understandably an enforced measure. In 30-degree heat, without removing their bulletproof vests and helmets and often spending the night there in their combat vehicles, 19-year-old lads and their commanders often honestly fulfill the important government task of maintaining peaceful life in Nagorno-Karabakh.

We ask the population of the NKAO—Armenians and Azerbaijanis—to give their opinion in letters to the Special Administration Committee and the military commandant's office regarding the need for and the possibility of withdrawing troops at present.

Azerbaijan Rail Chief Discusses Sabotage of Trains

PM1909144789 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 25 Aug 89 p 2

[Interview with Azerbaijan Railroad Chief E. Abdullayev by V. Dimitrov under the rubric "Topical Interview": "Loyalty to One's Duty"—date and place of interview not given; first two paragraphs are BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY introduction]

[Excerpt] Of late the Azerbaijan Railroad has been operating under great pressure. Many more railcars than envisaged by the norm are accumulating in its rolling stock every day. This has resulted in the disruption of the normal rhythm of railroad traffic.

Our correspondent has asked E. Abdullayev, chief of the Azerbaijan Railroad, to answer questions raised by the situation which has developed.

[Dimitrov] Elbrus Farmanovich, what is the explanation for the disruptions which are occurring on the railroad?

[Abdullayev] The problem is that a number of criminal acts have ben staged on the section of our railroad which runs through Armenian territory. Passenger trains and locomotives have come under a hail of stones, the track was obstructed, and a rail was damaged by an explosive device. This constituted a real threat to the safety of railroad traffic and the lives of passengers and engineers. Then the population of Mindzhivan station and Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] reacted to what had happened. Railroad traffic, both passenger and freight trains, including trains destined for Armenia, was paralyzed for several days.

A great many trains were detained at our stations and on the approaches to the Azerbaijan Railroad. Only after

engineers and their assistants were given assurances that measures would be taken to guarantee their safety did traffic resume.

However, on 7 August at Karchevan station, which is located on the section of our railroad which crosses Armenian territory, a freight train was again stopped and a passenger train came under attack on the approaches to the station. Windows in the railcars and the locomotives were smashed with stones. And traffic again came to a halt.

In an effort to defuse the situation, Armenian and Azerbaijani leaders and officials of the two republics' law enforcement organs and the Ministry of Railways visited the area. They met with collectives of railroad workers and the local population. Locomotive crews responded to the appeal to resume work with understanding, demanding only one thing—that the safety of trains and their own lives be guaranteed.

[Dimitrov] If I understood correctly, you are saying that the disruption of traffic was caused by outrages committed on Armenian territory. However, an interview with A. Kandilyan, chief of the Yerevan section of the Transcaucasian Railroad, published in the Yerevan newspaper KOMMUNIST under the title "When Train Traffic Is Blocked," claims the reverse, namely that passenger trains from Yerevan to Kafan have been attacked on Azerbaijani territory. Is this true?

[Abdullayev] His remarks are biased. He says, for instance, that a train which had been attacked arrived in Yerevan from Kafan 18 July. Our train arrived from Yerevan in Baku 15 July, that is 3 days earlier. The state of its cars, which had come under a hail of stones and other objects as it approached Karchevan station, beggars description. Luckily, there were no casualties. However, a number of passengers nonetheless suffered shock.

The events that followed, as I said earlier, were a reaction of the population of Mindzhivan and the Nakhichevan ASSR, whose emotions had got the better of them. Incidentally, the interview which you cite failed to mention a great many things such as obstructions on the section passing through Megrinskiy Rayon in Armenia and the act of sabotage which involved the use of an explosive device on that section. Incidentally, there was another explosion on the Megri-Karchevan stretch recently. On this occasion the explosive device went off unexpectedly and the criminal was killed. He was identified as one A. Parsadanyan, who lived far from Megrinskiy Rayon. The question is how he came to be there. [passage omitted]

12 Go on Trial in Fergana for Rioting

LD1909165189 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Fergana, Uzbekistan September 19 UZTAG-TASS—Twelve people accused of active participation in inter-ethnic clashes and atrocities in Soviet Uzbekistan's Fergana region early in June went on trial in the city today.

They will be tried in open court on charges of complicity in murder under aggravating circumstances and acts of hooliganism.

Tashkent 'Friendship' Festival Ends in Violence

LD1909201289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 19 Sep 89

["Excesses by Hooligans in Tashkent"—TASS headline]

[Text] Tashkent, (Uzbekistan), 19 Sep (Uztag-TASS)—A traditional 2-day carnival of friendship, held during the last vacation days in Tashkent, and directed at strengthening friendship of the peoples in the republic, ended in excesses. On Saturday, 16 September, having expressed dissatisfaction with the concert in which allegedly there were few Uzbek songs and dances, a crowd of some 300 persons, generally students, began to destroy garden benches and to overturn stalls and kiosks.

Militia workers managed to force the crowd out of the park. Along the road to the nearest subway station, the "Druzhba Narodov", the excesses continued; stones were thrown at cars and several vehicles were overturned; 21 people were arrested by the internal affairs bodies.

The crowd soon blockaded the building of the Chilanzarskiy Rayon department of Internal Affairs, demanding the release of the detainees. With great difficulty the militia employees managed to persuade the people to disperse. On Monday, the People's Court of Tashkent's Chilanzarskiy Rayon applied administrative measures to the majority of those detained: arrest, detention ranging from 5-15 days and nights, and fines.

On 17 September, after the 2d day of the carnival, a crowd of young people numbering approximately 100 persons carried out excesses at the "Druzhba Narodov" subway station, beating up several people. The crowd subsequently dragged a female train passenger, M., a medical college student, into a railway car, tore her clothing off, and subjected her to malicious insults. At the end of the subway line, at "Maksim Gorkiy" station, the girl was pushed out of the railway car and the crowd dispersed. On-duty militia workers at the subway stations did not even try to interfere. Not one hooligan was detained.

KGB Cautions Tajik On Incitements To Ethnic Hatred

PM2009082189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Who's Who"]

[Text] Dushanbe, 16 Sep—"Pluralism...glasnost...openness..." Unfortunately, references to these terms of democracy gained with such difficulty are being used

increasingly frequently by demagogues and, in a number of cases, even by evil people. According to a report from the press group of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] KGB, one such person, while in Pendzhikentskiy Rayon, advised local inhabitants on no account to support the candidate USSR people's deputy—a Russian. He said that this person would bring in his own Russians, build four-story houses, and squeeze out you Tajiks... Primitive? But it is known that primitivism frequently has an impact on a certain section of the population.

But who is the propagandist? Let us reveal this too. Mirbobo Mirrakhimov, associate in the philosophy sector of the Tajik Academy of Sciences. As a philosopher, he must know the methods of agitation and propaganda. For words are polysemous. The same information served with or without a special "sauce" can have opposite meanings and hidden implications. Who is building the mining and enriching combine? Russians. Who is polluting the river? Now we know who is poisoning us. A small point is excluded from the information: the fact that it is mainly Tajiks who work at the combine. That this resolves economic and social problems, including problems of employment. The same with the four-story houses. Mirrakhimov left a minor little fact out of the information—the "Housing-93" program adopted in Tajikistan, which provides for almost 50 percent of housing to be constructed by private builders. The republic savings bank alone has paid out R20 million in the form of long-term credits for these purposes in the space of 1 year.

Not all listeners put up with the philosopher's eccentricities. Once, at a meeting with readers of the newspaper PIONERI TODZHIKISTON and the magazine CHASHMA, half of the participants walked out of the room. What did the scientist talk about? This time his arrows were aimed at Uzbeks. What popularity the man tries to win!

We read working people's letters and comments from the party meetings of a number of organizations and we marvel. Why do people not cut Comrade Mirrakhimov short and tell him: "You're doing the wrong thing." Our scientist evidently perceives this silence as encouragement. In 10 years or so, he tells people, not one Russian will be left here. We will build our own Islamic republic, he says. The philosopher tries to promote his ideas on radio and television and in the press.

Here is one of Mirrakhimov's statements: "We will travel around the republic's rayons, meet in student hostels, and rouse them for the struggle against Russians, against the republic's leaders. We have a special score to settle with the Uzbeks, whom we will tackle after we have driven out the Russians." You could not put it more frankly.

In just the same way the Black Hundreds in tsarist Russia pointed their finger at Jews and national minorities. Need we remind you what misfortunes the kindling of national dissension leads to?

Quite naturally, the Tajik SSR KGB jointly with the republic Prosecutor's Office has issued an official warning to Mirbobo Mirrakhimov for such statements and inflammatory appeals, which could lead to grave consequences.

Anti-Army Attacks Prompt Baltic Military Address

PM1809152789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Irina Litvinova dispatch under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Address to Citizens of the Soviet Baltic Region"]

[Text] Riga—"We, members of the Red Banner Baltic Military District Military Council... feel forced to address you." So begins an address to citizens of the Soviet Baltic republics which has been published in the press and is signed by District Commander Colonel General F. Kuzmin and by Ya. Vagris, A. Brazauskas, and V. Vyalyas, first secretaries of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian Communist Party Central Committees respectively. The address says that it "was dictated by the complex situation taking shape in the Baltic region and the continuing attacks against the Soviet Army," and that "views are being implanted that the Soviet Army is an 'army of occupation' hostile to the Lithuanian, Lettish, and Estonian peoples." The address is imbued with pain and alarm: "The present cannot be examined from the positions of the past. The pain of the past cannot be the sole foundation of the future. Insults against the Army are also insults against our children." The following question is addressed to those who provoke the people into anti-Army actions: "We would like to ask some 'champions of national interests': Would the object of their concern have even existed today had the multinational Soviet Army not routed fascism?"

The address honestly speaks of the numerous problems of army service, voices the hope that they could be solved through joint efforts, and expresses doubts that these problems have "national roots" and doubts that "as soon as national formations are created, the problems with moral origins would disappear as if at the wave of a magic wand."

Landsbergis Views CPSU Baltics Statement

LD1909143089 Vilnius GIMTASIS KRASTAS in Lithuanian 31 Aug-6 Sep 89 p 6

[Reader's Letter by Vytautas Landsbergis]

[Individuals who have written this declaration (see PRAVDA 27 Aug of this year), either don't know much, or else, don't want to know anything. They are angered by Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Commission's announcement of conclusions concerning the USSR-Germany 1939 Agreements and their results; they are angered by the fact, the commission has its own opinion, while they, apparently, do not have an opinion and don't know anything about the fate, that befell three independent

European nations. The declaration condemns the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Commission for arriving at and publishing **independent** conclusions, without waiting for some type of conclusions to be arrived at by the other commission, in Moscow. Such regard for the right to independent thinking best reflects the Central Committee CPSU document's position—it has nothing in common with the recently publicized democracy and openess ideas, but has a lot in common—with Stalinist threats and ultimatum methods.

Information received by the Central Committee CPSU (rather its apparatus, calling itself, this time, the Central Committee), is very poor; they could orient themselves better, even from Central Television sources. For example, it states, without any basis, organizers of the "Baltic Road," succeeded in "fanning the moods **up to a point of real nationalist hysteria.**" Our ELTA (perhaps) translated this "up to **a certain** hysteria," wishing to thus somehow, soften the lie and to save Central Committee CPSU prestige. It would have been more useful to translate it accurately and then add a postscript: perhaps they (apparatus members) are not liars, but only individuals, deceived by "Yedinstvo" and similar informants, who have not had the time to check things out for themselves. The fact that so many of the declaration passages devoted to incitement and alienation appear to have been neatly transferred from "Yedinstvo" booklets is no accident. It seems a pity that restraint was shown only in pointing out which "nationalist forces" activities—for example, announced strikes—caused "painful losses to the republics'economy."

It is a fact, there has been much vandalism and mockery of sacred objects. That commenced in June of 1940 and continues to this day in certain areas. If the Central Committee CPSU apparatus workers think it did not exist previously, but only started during the restructuring period, they are sorely mistaken.

Neither the "simple individuals" nor those who are being reviled urge a break in relations with Soviet Union nations. Only authors of the Central Committee declaration are threatening: No one will see any improvement if economic and other relations are "severed with one blow." How can this happen and what for? Neighbors have always engaged in economic trade, have cooperated in other ways, and were friends at the same time. This is how things will continue to be. However, it is truly better not to have such "ties" as the declaration under discussion. While this is not possible, we will read it once more, with undying regret and sympathy.

The terrible word, "anti-Soviet," is repeated particularly frequently. This type of label earlier merited a sentence of up to 25 years or a nagan [pistol] bullet in the skull. The cost is terrible, but the commodity—guilt—is not, to date, clear. Who is this Soviet individual—since even high officals have admitted that the "Soviet Government" has not yet existed in the so-called Soviet Union, and that it will still be necessary to build it?

It becomes clear from this that "anti-Soviet" activity cannot be directed against a non-existent object—unless it is directed against the former worthless state structure, since we used the word "soviet" in the state's name. However, the structure really does need to be changed and restructured; the state is on the brink of disaster, and "anti-Soviet" M. Gorbachev had begun proclaiming this fact sometime ago.

It is no wonder, I would say, the loyal Soviets express their open hatred toward him. Even more so—toward reform movements.

Perhaps that "Soviet" does mean something? Perhaps it belongs directly to the state and is, indeed, its property? Thus, perhaps the title of the declaration ("Concerning the Situtation in the Republics of the Soviet Baltic") proclaims a "Soviet Baltic," that is owned and with some republics still located there.

How many other things are understood or portrayed there, contrary to what they are in actuality!

"The Central Committee CPSU understood from the very beginning..." Well, now, it did not understand for a long time what wrongs and dissatisfaction have accrued in the Baltic Republics and realized only following a three-year period that "it was necessary to renew the leadership," while as evidenced by this declaration it still fails to comprehend the basics.

The authors are "aware" from letters they receive that hundreds of thousands of individuals who participate in mass actions either do not understand or do not support the goals of their organizers; that the 23 August action has only one meaning—"to influence the Baltic Republic nations to a separation from the Soviet Union." The millions of victims, programmed on that same day, 50 years ago, are probably only trivia to the poor authors, unworthy of remembrance, flowers, crosses or prayers. The fact that such regard for the situation and such insolent declarations will only urge and dispose the Balts toward dreaming of and seeking the existence of an independent state, requires no comment.

It appears, by the way, as if the declaration has been written by two different authors. One—a fisted, table-banging and threatening anti-political type; the other—a persuader, resembling a political activist, who, in a quieter fashion, seeks arguments and dialogue openings.

Perhaps, however, they wrote in in this fashion until they assembled it and published it in the collective's name. For this purpose, the Central Committee CPSU becomes a certain political (juridical?) individual; such doubling of individuals on a country-wide scale becomes dangerous. After all, the first author threatens entire nations. "The question of their own suitability for existence (zhiznesposobnosti) [rendered in transliterated Russian] may arise." Even the daddy of nations did not speak out in this fashion unless it was done in secret protocols. The

second author proposes dialogue and a search for decisions and compromises; it seems we could hold talks with him.

Lithuanian Reader Reacts

LD1809135089 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 30 Aug 89 p 1

[Reader's letter by Andrius Juskevicius, lector ideology Section, Klaipeda City Party Committee, entitled "Let Us Separate The Chaff From the Grain."]

[Text] The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Declaration Concerning the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Area Republics—is not a single-minded document. We have reached a stage, where problems of union republic sovereignty and their relationship with the center, acquire a qualitatively new content and format. Our views are changing concurrently and new methods of ideological activity are taking root.

I was astounded by the categorical sounding allegations of the declaration. Some of them simply do not fit in with the realities of our existence. It is annoying, to have these presented on behalf of the Central Committee CPSU.

Our society is experiencing dynamic restructuring. We are becoming accustomed to speaking our minds and discussing vital questions, openly. A healthy dialogue, that consolidates national strength and where no one can claim an absolute truth monopoly is taking place.

Does the declaration reflect this? Unfortunately, the Baltic Republics' goal of strengthening economic and political independence is depicted tendentiously, there. Accusations of separatism carry a drift of the old time spirit. It is totally inexpedient for Lithuania to sever well-grounded relations with its neighbors. The people fully understand this and speak out for rational cooperation in all areas, without detriment to the right to national self-determination.

We are all concerned with national friction, that exists in certain regions of the country. Social and political tension sometimes transcends its limits. Can the same yardstick be applied to all, however?

The action, on 23 August, demonstrated once again, our nation has not lost its characteristic restraint and is seeking democracy in a constitutional manner. I did not see any extremist-oriented groups along the highway. I did not sense a real threat of citizen conflict, which so concerns those individuals who are so distant from the realities of Lithuania.

Let us continue with our restraint and not give in to angry emotions. I concur totally, with the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee's Plenum's voiced invitation to unite and sense the responsibility for the future of us all.

Let us not give in to provocations and let us restrain everyone, who attempts to instigate national discord. Since, such jesters—frankly speaking—can crop up. Recently, the Klaipeda Center Soviet Soldiers' Memorial was smeared with red paint by some evil hand. How should such behavior be regarded? Let us tell those individuals, who can not separate the chaff from the grain, pointblank—you are arresting the process of restructuring in Lithuania, and are harming her future and the nation's aspirations.

Further on 22 Aug Lithuanian 'Sajudis' Rally

PM1909134789 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 25 Aug 89 p 3

[V. Yanov report: "'We Demand Independence! And Fast!'"]

[Excerpts] ...The pines in Nagornyy Park have probably still not forgotten the words spoken here yesterday, 22 August, during a "Sajudis" rally: About the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, Lithuanian independence, Lithuanian statehood, and, at the same time, about common sense, tolerance, and a sober understanding of present realities, which make the path to sovereignty far from easy.

However, there is another view of all these things. It was expressed at another rally the next day, a sad day for the Baltic peoples, the day when the pact was signed between the great powers which stripped the small countries of their statehood. The following took part in the rally, organized by the Union for Lithuanian Independence: representatives of the League for the Freedom of Lithuania, the Committee To Save Political Prisoners, the Helsinki Group, the Lithuanian Democratic Party, the Union of Christian Democrats, and other organizations. [passage omitted]

Representatives of the Union for Lithuanian Independence have their own opinion regarding the intentions of the center and their own forecast of the possible future development of events. "Moscow does not even try to hide the fact that its foreign policy toward Lithuania is still just as inflexible and aggressive," A. Terlyatskas, one of the leaders of the League for the Freedom of Lithuania, said. "Moscow will make every effort to ensure that our newly elected Supreme Soviet legitimizes the present political status quo in Lithuania." This, in turn, the speaker believes, could lead to a situation where foreign states which at present do not recognize the annexation of Lithuania could in the future recognize it as legally part of the Soviet Union.

Several times during the speeches, the alarming phrase "Lithuania is in danger!" was heard. Within the context of the rally, it was generally clear in a matter of minutes where this danger comes from, of what it consists, and how it should be withstood. One young man, who, to the credit of the organizers, was not allowed onto the rostrum, chose a highly interesting form of resistance. Refused access to the rostrum, he walked between the rows, waving his Soviet passport and urging everyone to

throw away theirs. Otherwise, he said, how could there be any discussion? But this radical step failed to find support from the rally participants.

On the other hand, a resolution addressed to the Lithuanian public, the council of the "Sajudis" Sejm, and the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet was greeted with a storm of applause. It says, in particular: "The Lithuanian people will never be reconciled to occupation. The people want to restore Lithuanian independence. While admitting the criminal nature of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and the secret protocols to it, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet commission has failed to draw the political conclusions with regard to restoring legality concerning Lithuania..." The resolution went on to demand that the Supreme Soviet adopt a law declaring the 1940 Sejm decision null and void and proclaiming the restoration of independence in the Lithuanian Republic.

The Molotov-Ribbentrop pact was also condemned by representatives of social movements in Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Moldavia—republics which were also the victims of this secret compact. A member of the Democratic Union from Moscow said that there was not and could not be any question of Lithuania seceding from the Soviet Union because Lithuania has never been part of the USSR. The rally was also greeted by representatives of the "Yaunoyi Letuva" organization and Lithuanian emigres.

...But after the rally I learned that I am not an occupier. True, I could not have known this from the placards. I was told this by A. Terlyatskas.

[Terlyatskas] By occupiers we mean only members of the military. The Red Army in the past and the Soviet Army now. But as far as civilians are concerned, we believe that all people living in the republic should fight for Lithuanian independence, regardless of their nationality. There was one provocative placard here which read: "Occupiers and colonists! Your homeland, Russia, awaits you!" I took it down, but someone put it up again. That really is provocation, which only exacerbates interethnic relations. But nothing like that was said in the speeches, as you heard.

[Yanov] But what about the young man who urged everyone to throw away their Soviet passports?

[Terlyatskas] We did not allow him onto the rostrum. I had spoken to him the day before and realized that he was not in his right mind. That is probably why he did what he did.

[Yanov] Whatever, why does a gradual, parliamentary progression toward independence not suit the League for the Freedom of Lithuania and the Union of Lithuanian Independence in general?

[Terlyatskas] We are convinced that the parliamentary path leads to deadlock. It is illogical. First of all we must rectify the blatant violation of international law, restore historical justice, and restore the statehood of the Lithuanian republic. Otherwise, without this, what will the Law on Citizenship mean if there is no state? And what will be the point of the Declaration of Independence adopted by the Supreme Soviet session 18 May? Our deputies were not even allowed to read it at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies...

[Yanov] Let us suppose that you get what you want and the republic moves toward independence your way. What will the consequences be? In economic terms, for example?

[Terlyatskas] Nothing particular will happen. There are precedents in history. Britain, for example, did not sever its economic relations with its former colonies when they became independent... [passage omitted]

Latvian Party Central Committee Changes Made

PM1909153589 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 1 Sep 89 p 1

[LATVIAN NEWS AGENCY report: "Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum: Information Report"]

[Text] As has already been reported in the press, a Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum examined an organizational question 30 August.

The plenum co-opted onto the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Ya.V. Blazhevich, first secretary of Ventspils City Party Committee; A.F. Brigmanis, first secretary of Saldusskiy Rayon Party Committee [raykom]; I.A. Garayev, first secretary of Leninskiy Party Raykom; and A.A. Silinsh, chairman of the Latvian Republic Trade Union Council.

A.F. Brigmanis, first secretary of Saldusskiy Party Raykom, was elected a member of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

Latvian Party Calls for Autonomy Within Federation

PM1909152189 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 1 Sep 89 p 1

[Latvian Communist Party Central Committee "Appeal to Communists and All Working People in the Republic in Connection With the CPSU Central Committee Statement 'On the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics'"; published under the rubric "Let Us Preserve the United Family of Soviet Peoples and Unity Within the Ranks of the CPSU!"]

[Text] The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum points out that the CPSU Central Committee Statement "On the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics" of 26 August 1989 provoked a broad and disparate response in the republic. In discussing the CPSU Central Committee Statement, party organs and labor collectives analyze the complex and contradictory sociopolitical situation with a sense of responsibility and

share the CPSU Central Committee's concern and alarm over the development of the perestroyka processes in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

When discussing the CPSU Central Committee Statement, many labor collectives and party organizations voiced disagreement with the generalizing assessments which fail to take into account the original nature of the development of the situation in every republic, including the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

Radical changes have indeed occurred over a short period in Latvia's sociopolitical life. Broad strata of the population have set about the process of renewing sociopolitical life, mass sociopolitical organizations have formed, political pluralism and glasnost have developed rapidly, and people's national self-awareness is reviving swiftly.

These processes are taking place in a contradictory fashion against the backdrop of the complex historical legacy and worsening socioeconomic and demographic problems and political radicalism is making itself felt. The radical break with the old social structures and the creation of new ones is inevitably accompanied by a certain destabilization of the economic and social situation. However, one cannot fail to see that the situation in Soviet Latvia has still been complex of late owing to actions and appeals by certain representatives of individual social formations satisfying their excessive political ambitions.

But the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee is convinced that the activeness of the extremist groupings which are trying to effectively bar the way to perestroyka in all manners does not and cannot have a crucial effect on the process of renewal within the republic.

The CPSU Central Committee Statement is seen in Soviet Latvia as a call to take another self-critical look at the first years of perestroyka and map out urgent measures to implement economic and political reforms, democratize public life, and assert glasnost.

In this connection Communists and non-party people must carry out great work to implement the Latvian Communist Party's action program, which determines the basic avenues for constructive and consolidating efforts on the part of the republic party organization at the time of preparations for the next Latvian Communist Party Congress.

The Latvian Communist Party and other constructive social forces in the republic champion the right of every nation to self-determination and are endeavoring to ensure Latvian sovereignty within a qualitatively renewed federation of Soviet republics based on stable contractual relations.

That is why we support the irreversible progressive changes throughout the USSR and the improvement of our federation, the basic principles for which are laid out in the CPSU platform "The Nationalities Policy of the Party in Present Conditions."

The future of the Latvian people and of all Latvia's inhabitants is directly and indissolubly linked with the success of the course of renewal throughout the Soviet Union. We are convinced that there can be no sovereign Latvia without perestroyka, since there can be no perestroyka and renewal of socialism on Latvian soil without Latvian sovereignty.

A renewed society needs a renewed party, and the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum stresses that we favor profound democratization of party life and a new status for the Latvian Communist Party within the CPSU in full accordance with the sovereignty of the Latvian SSR within the USSR.

The Latvian Communist Party is convinced that Latvia must secure economic autonomy for the republic in the interests of all Latvia's inhabitants. Its aim and purpose lies in providing a better life for all Latvia's inhabitants. Our policy is humane, does not infringe the interests of any national group, and does not discriminate against or oppress anyone. The republic cannot flourish without a strong flexible economy in line with international standards.

In the face of the deterioration in the economic situation we must rally together in order to implement the vital interests that are common to all. Under these conditions all internal dissension and confrontation between national groups is particularly dangerous, in fact even fatal, and appeals for this and provocative actions are simply criminal.

The Latvian Communist Party believes that representatives of any nationality need social and legal guarantees and must feel calm and confident. That is why it advocates the elaboration of a Latvian SSR Law on Nationalities and other constructive measures in this sphere.

The party has today abandoned methods of administrative diktat and has an understanding attitude to manifestations of different opinions and ideas.

The cause of democratizing society and the policy of glasnost presented us with a unique historic chance which everyone is interested in realizing.

The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum urges Communists and all working people in the republic to implement the economic, social, and political transformations mapped out by the Latvian Communist Party action program through creative labor.

Aware of its responsibility for the fate of Latvia's people and every one of its residents, the Latvian Communist Party urges everyone to calm and unity for the sake of prosperity for the republic and the renewal of socialism on Latvian soil.

Latvia's fate and its future are in our hands.

Democratic Movement Conference Opens in Leningrad

LD1609153689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1511 GMT 16 Sep 89

[Text] Leningrad, 16 Sep (TASS)—TASS correspondents Maksim Korzhov and Konstantin Trifonov report:

A conference of the country's democratic movements and organizations opened here today. Representatives of 51 organizations from 31 towns in the Soviet Union have registered to take part in it, including representatives of the Leningrad Popular Front, the 'Sajudis' organization from the Republic of Lithuania, and others.

The conference was opened by Yuriy Afanasyev, a people's deputy of the USSR representing the interregional group of people's deputies of the USSR. He called for the country's democratic forces to unite.

The conference is discussing the general tasks of the democratic movement, issues concerning the coordination of its activity, and problems of the national-territorial structure. Criticism is also being heard from the rostrum in connection with the crisis phenomena in the economy and in agriculture.

There is a press center in the foyer of the Palace of Culture where the conference is being held, where necessary information and printed material of the various movements may be obtained.

The conference is intended to last 3 days.

People's Control Committee Hears of Shortcomings

LD1609181989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Sep 89

[Text] A meeting of the members of the USSR People's Control Committee and the chairmen of the People's Control committees of the union republics and a number of oblasts in the Russian non-chernozem zone was held today at the USSR People's Control Committee. Urgent measures were discussed to increase the effectiveness of the control of work, given the economic management and administration methods, and of the national economy's preparations for winter.

A report was delivered by Kolbin, chairman of the committee. The prime task of the People's Control system is to play an active part in resolving matters that should remove social tension, and in particular in the winter preparations. This is closely linked to the transportation of freight. Rolling stock congestion has developed in a number of major industrial centers. The sea ports have a glut of provisions and essential goods that have arrived from abroad. Many power stations have no fuel reserves. The People's Control Committee has charged all its committees and groups—along with the press—with taking steps to eliminate the shortcomings and infringements.

KGB Staffers Meet Representatives of 'Memorial'

PM1909132789 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Aug 89 p 2

[Report by A. Oligov: "KGB and 'Memorial': Businesslike Contacts. A Matter of Honor and Conscience"]

[Text] Members of the Moscow "Memorial" association and KGB employees have met at the "Sovremennik" culture center. The state security officers told the "Memorial" members about the rehabilitation work they are currently carrying out in conjunction with the prosecutor's office.

All decisions by nonjudicial organs have been revoked. But this very important act of justice is only the start. In fact, it is necessary to examine the materials of all criminal cases over a more than 30-year period. Establishing the abode of those who were subjected to unwarranted repression and their relatives, examining in full queries and requests in accordance with citizens' submissions, sending notification of rehabilitation—this is just one aspect of the massive legal program. But there is also the purely human aspect—determining as accurately as possible the fate of innocent victims. Finding any surviving personal documents, photographs, and manuscripts and determining the actual date, place, and cause of death...

State security personnel are studying a mass of documents and are interviewing former employees of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs [NKVD] who had something to do with the tragic events or have authentic information about where shootings or burials took place.

The state security personnel answered numerous questions. They condemned unequivocally and uncompromisingly the tyranny and legal free-for-all of the Stalin era. There is not a single person in the USSR KGB organs at present who was in any way associated with the implementation of the repressions. Since 1953 there have been 1,342 convictions (including death sentences) of NKVD-Ministry of State Security employees for breaching the socialist rule of law, for despotic actions, for falsifying information, and for using illicit investigative methods. Some 2,370 have been dismissed, stripped of military ranks, and deprived of pensions and government awards. Each of the culprits was taken severely to task by the party.

The tragedy of that time was the fact that the lawlessness "on high" was elevated to the status of the law [for those] down below. The wielders of the "law" were purveyors of a distorted morality and a barbarous notion of civic duty.

Democratization, glasnost, total accountability to the organs of Soviet power, constant contact with the public and the press—this is the only style of KGB activity that corresponds to the present day and insures against a repetition of the tragedy of the past.

Today's KGB personnel regard the noble work rehabilitating all their compatriots who were victims of injustice as their paramount public duty and as a matter of professional honor.

Radiation 'Disaster' at Moscow Metalworks

LD1909122989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From the press review]

[Text] MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS carries a very alarming report entitled: Until the Thunder Sounds.

Wired-off, huge, great mountains of metal; sinister yellow and red notices, saying: Caution: radioactivity; people in gas masks with radiation meters; special vehicles with protected bodies and sirens; danger zone. Where do you think you could find such a picture? Only several dozen kilometers from Moscow.

The disaster at the Podolsk nonferrous metal works struck suddenly, although experts think it should have been expected. During a routine radiation measuring inspection of the Moscow suburbs here, sectors of high radiation were detected. A search for the source showed that along with scrap metal, the raw material which the works uses, someone had dumped some 200 tons of radioactive materials here. It is almost impossible now to say who did it because the scrap comes from all parts of the country.

The Procuracy is conducting an investigation, but meanwhile, there are hundrds of tons of contaminated waste on the grounds of the works, and hence, of the city. How can they be disposed of? In what safe place can this sinister cargo be kept? How can the concomitant production and social problems be solved? So many problems have arisen now at one works, and not only there. The local authorities, too, evidently cannot cope. Perhaps the problem should be tackled at a different level, and tackled urgently, for it is people's health and safety that are at risk.

Commission Tours Post-Chernobyl Polluted Areas

PM1909151789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the rubric "Echo of Chernobyl" "In the Zone of Rigorous Monitoring"]

[Text] The tasks of overcoming the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES] in Russian federation rayons were discussed at an out-of-town session of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Emergency Situations. The commission members headed by V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, visited Bryansk Oblast's Krasnogorskiy and Novozybkovskiy Rayons, which have been subjected to radioactive contamination, viewed a number of sociocultural projects, and familiarized themselves with the progress of decontamination work in the zone of rigorous monitoring.

The commission session heard a report by the oblast soviet executive committee [oblispolkom] on the fulfillment of measures to ensure safe living conditions for the population in the radiation zone and analyzed a draft long-term program to overcome the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES in the "contaminated" rayons of Bryansk Oblast.

The commission participated in the work of a meeting of the oblast's party and economic aktiv. The report by Oblispolkom Chairman V.G. Syrovatko and other speeches reported that a package of measures aimed at ensuring safe living conditions for the population of the "contaminated" rayons has been implemented during the 3 years since the accident. Considerable capital investment has been assimilated in housing, sociocultural, and road construction, and a large amount of decontamination work has been carried out. All the rayons' inhabitants are provided with clean foodstuffs from state resources, and systems of wage increments and allowances to obtain foodstuffs have been introduced in the zones of constant and rigorous monitoring. However, the morale and psychological situation remains complex. In addition, many of the republic's ministries and departments have reduced the volumes of aid to the oblast over the past 2 years. Omissions in the work of local organs were examined.

V.Kh. Doguzhiyev addressed the aktiv meeting, pointing to the need to concretize the program proposed for discussion to overcome the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster, drawing special attention to shortcomings in medical services for the population, and demanding greater promptness of local organs of power in preparing to move the inhabitants of villages and hamlets in the zone of rigorous monitoring to clean territories.

On the commission's recommendation the party and economic aktiv meeting adopted for nationwide discussion and subsequent finalization a draft program for eliminating the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES in Bryansk Oblast rayons during 1991-1995.

Economic

Pavlov Queried on Finance, Investment Decisions

18200451 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 7 Sep 89 p 2

[Report on interview with USSR Minister of Finance V.S. Pavlov by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA special correspondent M. Rostarchuk at the USSR Ministry of Finance in Moscow; date and occasion not specified: "Financier, Time, and Money"]

[Text] I first met Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov in the auditorium of the USSR Supreme Soviet when his

candidacy for one of the key positions in the new government, that of the minister of finance, was discussed. An information sheet handed out to the deputies said that the contender would turn 52 this year. He is a Muscovite. He graduated from the Moscow Finance Institute as an economist. He is a CPSU member, a doctor of economic sciences, and the chairman of the All-Union Economic Society. Within his ministry, he started out as an inspector of the rayon department of finance and climbed up to the first deputy minister before he was transferred to the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] to become a department chief and member of the collegium, and subsequently to the State Committee for Prices, this time to be its chairman.

It appeared that this last circumstance could be in Pavlov's disfavor.

However, events in the auditorium took an unexpected turn. In the course of the debate, the contender for the ministerial post described the financial situation in a balanced, frank, and realistic manner as being quite dangerous (the state debt may come to 400 billion rubles in the nearest future). Having indicated the causes and consequences of this, explained the need for taking emergency measures, and presented a large-scale program for curing the financial and credit system and a new budgetary and tax policy based on new approaches, V. Pavlov clearly gained favor with the deputies. The result is known: They voted "in favor" unanimously, and V. Pavlov left the rostrum to the applause of the audience—for the first time in many days of debate over the composition of the new government.

We talked with Valentin Sergeyevich confidentially and for a long time, in the evening, long after the people left the somewhat dreary and quite old building of the ministry on Kuybyshev Street. Respectable finance business and banking the world over include traditions, even the purely superficial ones. The quite spacious office of the minister, with light wood trim, stern and even ascetic, in the style of chambers of luminaries from the Stalin era, apparently also appealed to A.N. Kosygin when he occupied this position in the late 1940's, to be sure, not for long. At any rate, the interior of the office—light furniture in the corners, a long conference table, a carpet runner, a football field-size desk—has not changed since. A tall grandfather clock still counts time reliably and without emotion, as it counted the hours and days of the times of arbitrariness and stagnation.

As an old-timer in the ministry, Valentin Sergeyevich explained the presence in the office of a globe with a diameter of 1 meter. This was a present from airline personnel amounting a hint: At the time, the Aeroflot was only beginning to operate on international routes, and it needed hard currency. I asked: Does this globe say at present that it is time for the ruble as well to become convertible and enter the international currency market? In the process, I recalled that SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA recently carried an article by the well-known American economist Marshall Goldman who recommended that ruble convertibility be introduced right now, overnight by a government decree. Is the minister prepared to follow the advice of the expert quite well-versed in such matters?

[Pavlov] Certainly, this is a spectacular proposal, but it is more suitable for teaching a novice how to swim: Push him out of a boat at a deep spot, and, if he does not drown, he will swim. However, in these cases I still prefer to measure, as they say, the depth and height of a jump, and prepare life-saving devices.

[Rostarchuk] Perhaps, you are a conservative, that is, in the positive meaning of this word?

[Pavlov] In any event he who the people trust with their coffers should be a realist rather than an adventurer. In our field, one cannot work without reason, discretion, caution, balance, and, at the same time, resolve.

[Rostarchuk] What about risk? Does a real financier never take risks?

[Pavlov] To me, risk is what improvisation is to a good actor. It has to be carefully rehearsed and prepared. Any financial action, especially a large-scale one, involves an element of risk. However, it is your duty to predict the situation in such a manner as to definitely secure at least 100 percent of what you have planned.

Economics is like chess—apparently, everything can be calculated. However, every time an unconventional move comes up which, to be sure, entails certain risks. There is no risk if you do nothing, but in this case you lose control of events.

[Rostarchuk] However, thus far, already in the time of perestroyka, our financial policy has been merely responding to events. Has the critical moment come when we have to act and, therefore, take risks?

[Pavlov] This is very true. Unfortunately, we have been late indeed in restructuring finances and restructuring the entire cost mechanism. For many years, we have been trying to streamline individual nodes of our entire economic system and adjust them to changing conditions. In the process, even functionally equal problems were solved at different times and along different guidelines. Meanwhile, accumulating contradictions undermined the foundation of the economy, and it gave way, it cracked. What we got was the Brown movement of contradictions in all elements of the machinery of state. At present, these contradictions are manifested in different ways. For example, society requires that inexpensive high-quality goods for children be manufactured, but producer enterprises are not interested in this. All of us would like the quality of products to improve everywhere, but production personnel do not need this, as they are paid on the basis of quantity, of gross output. Republics, krays, oblasts, regions, and, finally, labor collectives strive to develop the social sphere, while the center most often cares to develop the production sphere... for the sake of production itself.

All of these local sores and hotbeds coalesced into extensive zones of pathology; the disease of the economic organism exacerbated to such a degree that its life processes became impossible within the framework of the old system.

[Rostarchuk] Where is the pivotal element, the key to curing the patient?

[Pavlov] If we acknowledge that the market is becoming the foundation of the economy, then we should first of all change all value ratios, revise the conditions for purchasing and selling, for income distribution and redistribution, for income utilization. It is no less important to change the instruments of management. Thus far, they have operated in natural units—tons of metal, coal, oil, fertilizer, cubic meters of timber, pieces, meters, anything but value indicators. Market means primarily value management. This is to say that the model of economic management needs to be restructured.

[Rostarchuk] Does the entire credit and financial system need to be restructured accordingly?

[Pavlov] Exactly.

[Rostarchuk] Perhaps, this is no simple task, given that the budget deficit exceeds 100 billion rubles, and the state debt 300 billion rubles. Incidentally, Valentin Sergeyevich, what does this hard-to-imagine state debt consist of—an entire Mt. Everest of paper bills, but what are they invested in?

[Pavlov] These are so-called set-aside rubles; they are not invested in some kind of valuables. This is the money which the state has already "consumed." For a decade and a half, we have been living on credit devouring more than we have earned. We have borrowed money from our grandchildren when we sold oil and timber; we have also borrowed from the populace, and have used without restraint what our fathers and grandfathers created. Our fixed assets—equipment and machine tools—have become obsolete, and their renewal is lagging decades behind contemporary requirements.

[Rostarchuk] What is to counter this monstrous debt?

[Pavlov] Production capital, fixed assets, and the mass of raw and other materials. However, all of this wealth is invested to a great degree in something that does not work to benefit man. This is what we call the heavy-set structure of production. The state has borrowed money but it cannot return material values to a person in the form of consumer goods which he needs because the production of the means of production was mostly augmented... in order to boost the production of the means of production rather than consumer goods. This is to say that the structure of production needs to be changed.

[Rostarchuk] This won't be accomplished in a day. How do you as a minister of finance intend to put together a budget—with "holes" and "debts?"

[Pavlov] As a priority step, we intend to use the experience of other countries and split the budget into two—the current and development budgets. In the process, the current budget may be designed without a deficit as soon as 1990, without reducing the standard of living of the populace. Such a program has already been worked out; it includes the items of expenditure which we cannot forego by any means. Naturally, we will have to cut back on certain things. As far as the development budget is concerned, we should carefully discuss all programs and projects yet again in the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet—about 2,000 of them which require capital investment—and decide which ones can be abandoned and which ones can be scaled down.

[Rostarchuk] However, these are, so to say, ways to "cut off the oxygen." Is the development of the economy possible at all under such circumstances?

[Pavlov] You are right. In this manner, we will only ensure the respite which we so badly need in order to regroup our forces. However, from the standpoint of strategy, this is a dead end. The country can realistically develop, and its finances may get stronger only through developing production and commerce, but in such a manner that the volume of resources reaching the market increases.

[Rostarchuk] To this end, it is needed....

[Pavlov] ...It is necessary to sharply increase the return on every ruble invested.

[Rostarchuk] When you were confirmed as a minister by the USSR Supreme Soviet, you quoted impressive statistics: In 1960, goods worth 1 ruble 42 kopecks were available for 1 ruble of the monetary mass, whereas at present only 18 kopecks worth of goods. In addition, we might say that these rubles, which weak to the point of breaking down, are different: There is one ruble in rural areas, a different one in Tallinn, yet another one in Siberia; the ruble of a retiree is on its last leg, whereas the ruble of a minister is much more vigorous.

[Pavlov] Unfortunately, such is objective reality. In terms of "weight," these rubles will hardly become equal soon. The strategic "balance of forces" throughout the entire economy needs to be changed in order to change the situation with the varying availability [of goods] for the ruble. In this case, we will also stimulate an increase in demand by giving people extra income, to which the economy will respond immediately. The ruble should ensure the migration of capital, labor, and material resources to where the demand exists. The ruble will once again provide access to goods and will acquire equal value when wholesale and retail merchandise markets appear in our country.

[Rostarchuk] The so-called unearned money paid out at enterprises is associated with the "empty" ruble and inflation. However, has not a worker who has filled an order with good quality and on time, or a bricklayer who has erected a wall, earned the money he is paid?

[Pavlov] Certainly, he is not at fault if the machine into which the part made has been inserted has turned out to be unnecessary, or the construction project incomplete. Those who manage a given industry or enterprise are to blame for him working without accomplishing anything for the country. This is why, in referring to inflation-control measures, we do not mean revisions of the norms, pay grades, and tariffs, but demand that the management of production and the economy as a whole be changed. Furthermore, we would like to set in motion a financial mechanism which would make increasing prices disadvantageous, say, by introducing a tax on increased prices if they do not reflect a new quality of products exactly.

[Rostarchuk] Incidentally, one of the items in your program of curing finances envisages the cancellation of multiple payments to the budget, restrictions on channels for the appropriation of funds by the budget, transition to the tax principle, and a shift toward direct mutual relations between our budget and financial system and enterprises.

[Pavlov] I believe that we have to begin with restoring the budgetary rights of union republics and territories, with reinforcing the base of local budgets, beginning with the settlement soviet and through the oblast and the kray, in other words, we must change the budget mechanism completely. If we want the soviets at all levels to acquire genuine power and solve economic problems they should be given guaranteed revenue.

At present, the soviets do not generate funds but merely collect and transfer them to the center, and subsequently receive them back; that is to say, the principle of budgetary regulation applies. It is well-conceived: If the local organs collect funds poorly, they will not receive them either. However, since the local soviet could, under the best of circumstances, collect only one-fourth of what the region objectively needed, and still had to ask for the rest, its interest in straining itself, making money, and boosting revenue was not great, if any at all. However, if things were set up in such a manner that the local soviet could also generate funds itself and "fork over" to the center only a small segment, and even that on a mutually advantageous basis, this would be different, there would be an incentive. If, on top of that, these norms were not going to change within a 5-year plan, it would make even more sense to make money. Then the soviet would be interested in accepting new production facilities within its jurisdiction, developing trade and the social sphere. After all, all of this may generate profits, as well as taxes on local resources, on investments....

[Rostarchuk] However, in this event the entire structure of our financial organs should be different.

[Pavlov] Certainly. I am now thinking about a new standard structure of financial organs. Their local divisions should be involved in forming the budget. In this prospective budgetary system based on unified tax rates, we will no longer need ministries; thus far, they have been submitting to the Ministry of Finance drafts, collected from enterprises and adjusted in favor of the center, which the ministries subsequently sent down the chain of command again. It should be different: Enterprises submit drafts based on the tax rates to local departments of finance in their capacity of an organ of the local soviet, which claims a share of proceeds of all enterprises, including those reporting to union ministries.

Our tax rates should be universal and fair, and should take into account the efficiency of labor. Tax collection is a direct-impact action involving the state, central, and local authorities with regard to any labor collective or private person. Financial relations become lucid, clearly formulated, and cannot depend on arbitrary decisions of any ministry or office.

In other words, direct linkage is established between the financial system and the producers; the reorientation of this system toward the immediate productive echelon rather than the ministries and offices, the managerial echelon, occurs. This is how the financial system which concentrates a considerable segment of economic cadres becomes a powerful catalyst for economic operations in the field.

Financial organs become an "instrument" of local authorities geared to finding ways for increasing returns on every ruble. This is a tremendous force!

[Rostarchuk] Extending your line of reasoning, we might expect that the financial inspector, or more precisely, the tax inspector will become a quite different character, significant, and even threatening....

[Pavlov] Indeed, he will be a whole different character. He has to be brought back yet. He has to be the foundation for the unity of financial policy, and a guardian of the revenue base of the state. Certainly, some might say: "Oh, this was the case at the time when they cut down apple trees and counted chickens." Naturally, we need to be mindful of the extremes, but it should be kept in mind that the tax inspector, first of all, performs the functions which the system has assigned to him. If the system changes, his task will change too.

On the other hand, financial discipline is a necessary element of the socialist market as well. Tax evasion has existed, exists, and will exist not only over there, "on the other side of the fence," but in our country as well, because we have decided to switch to market relations, and on an increasing scale at that, just as corruption corroding our society which has now reared its ugly head.

[Rostarchuk] If we are to talk about negative phenomena in our economy, the billions of rubles in the "shadow economy," perhaps, rob you as the minister of finance of your sleep. Do you see a radical way to combat it?

[Pavlov] Of course, economic measures are most efficient. Saturating the market is the first such measure. After all, our "shadow economy" is geared to exploiting

shortages, unlike the Western one, which uses illegal channels—underreporting prices, tax evasion, contraband, trade mark infringements—in order to break into an overly saturated market....

[Rostarchuk] Doesn't this "black money" make a weighty contribution to disrupting monetary circulation?

[Pavlov] If only it were just this money! At present, more than 100 billion rubles are in circulation, including the ones that are "in the mattresses," another 300 billion are in savings banks, plus 30 billion rubles in the "shadow economy." For normal monetary circulation, 35 to 50 billion would suffice for us. In all of this, troubles in the economy prompt us to turn on the printing press every now and then, and proceed with the emission of currency.

[Rostarchuk] I would like to believe that the minister of finance still has a prescription for the medicine which may bring our elevated "monetary pressure" to a normal level....

[Pavlov] The first thing we need to do is to restrict credit expansion, plug up the channels through which excessive saturation of the economy with credit funds occurs. We can no longer provide loans without any connection with the needs of the economy, just in order to cover losses. We can no longer pay out the money which buys nothing. After all, this is the reason for unfinished construction projects which are paid for and unjustified price increases in the production sphere (you have money in your account, and you are prepared to pay 2, or even 3 times the price as long as you can turn the money into merchandise).

[Rostarchuk] Is it difficult to plug up these channels—payments boosting the deficit, unjustified credit?

[Pavlov] There are no simple ways. This may only be accomplished through forming a production plan, restricting budgetary expenditures and credit, and an active policy of savings.

I believe that the current savings policy is as anachronistic as the financial policy. After all, both of them interact and complement each other. At present, the interest rate on deposits in savings banks does not depend on the duration of deposit. The interest rate should depend on the time for which you have loaned me the money. After all, I will put this money to use, and I have to pay you for this service, for the risk—mutual risk, by the way—as it is, you may withdraw the money earlier than stated.

[Rostarchuk] As the minister of finance, are you satisfied with the operation of our banks?

[Pavlov] By no means! Our banks have to learn managing the money market, the market of capital.

[Rostarchuk] It yet has to be created!

[Pavlov] Correct, but we will have to create a mechanism which would fit in our economy in order to create a financial and money market and manage it. We will have to train people and set up organizational structures. There is the experience of the past, but there are hardly any people who could become the initiators of this endeavor. Alas, several generations of Soviet financiers have already come for whom "the capital market" amounts to "alien customs." In the absence of this market, it is impossible to endow the budget with a new content.

Here is a simple example. What is a share which has reappeared in our economic life? After all, it may be viewed not only as a security yielding dividends, but also as an instrument of economic management. Say, the VAZ [Volga Car] Works suffers continuously due to the unreliability of contractor enterprises. Then the VAZ, which is directly interested in the efficiency of operation at these enterprises, begins to purchase their shares and thus secures an opportunity to strictly control their operations and the state of affairs in production.

[Rostarchuk] Valentin Sergeyevich, you have big plans. However, the mentality of the apparatus of the ministry and all finance organs, may need to be changed. Thus far, the apparatus has been on another wavelength—control and "keep them in check."

[Pavlov] To a considerable degree, this is true. People in our ministry must learn to see real interests and the driving forces of the activities of other people behind statistics and papers. They must see how people and material resources shift following the movement of money. If they manage to see this and understand that in their new capacity they can not only control, ban, or authorize something, but also create, then they will draw the satisfaction from work which they have long been lacking.

[Rostarchuk] That is, they must become financiers in the utmost meaning of this word.

[Pavlov] And on a grand scale—they should become people who think in economic categories and realities of our life rather than extras and record-takers.

[Rostarchuk] Valentin Sergeyevich, is it easy to become a minister? Have you just been lucky encountering good people in your life, or have your personality traits been a factor?

[Pavlov] Perhaps, all of the above. At any rate, having started out as a financial inspector in Kalininskiy Rayon of the capital city and having been assigned to two mechanized bakery plants and one bakery, I did not even dream about a ministerial post.

[Rostarchuk] There is the expression "career diplomat," that is, a competent professional who has gone all the way from "a" to "z." You are a career official. What is your attitude toward the apparatus which is now catching it all the time?

[Pavlov] I think that in proclaiming the apparatus to be the main opponent of perestroyka the public has taken a position with regard to it which is not quite considered. Only now have they begun acknowledging through clenched teeth that the apparatus is necessary. The heart of the matter is in the fact that a qualitatively new apparatus is needed. It must be placed in such an environment, including economic environment, that it would become one of the powerful engines of perestroyka.

[Rostarchuk] In the 1970's, you were associated through your scientific work with the Kazan Finance Institute, and took part in developing models and methods for drawing up territorial financial balances. Your current plans are the continuation of that work. However, at the time your work was not put to use....

[Pavlov] The system did not need it because it operated on a different principle, though our methods could indeed be used even then not only as an instrument of long-range examination of the economy of a republic or territory but also as a management instrument.

I always organically failed to go along with the suppression of the role of finance in the system of management when the administrative system reduced finances and monetary circulation only to supporting planned assignments. After all, this is how the minister of finance used to report it to the Supreme Soviet: The union budget has been compiled in keeping with the national economic plan and supports all of its assignments and indicators by financial resources. It was less important how this was done and at the expense of what.

[Rostarchuk] Is this why the mounting budget deficit was kept secret?

[Pavlov] They simply did not cal-cu-la-te it! So, this is how a legion of economic managers at all levels sprang up who do not understand that money has to be earned. Contrary to all objective economic laws, the slogan "Price is no object" was in effect. This is how the cost-based mechanism of economic operations and management in the entire national economy came to be. However, in keeping with the law of unity of monetary circulation, everything is reflected sooner or later in the circulation of goods and money. Everything boils down to the store shelves, and troubles become apparent—price increases, inflation, budget deficit. They are all links in one chain—this is exactly how it is.

[Rostarchuk] Did you have during these years a feeling of split personality, an inner contradiction between what you saw and knew and the things you had to do?

[Pavlov] This happened indeed.

[Rostarchuk] How did you relieve the stress? Did you get wrapped up in science?

[Pavlov] I did what I could. After all, I had some power, and I succeeded in pushing certain things through. Of course, there was a period when I very much wanted to break away from the system and into science. I did not succeed. I worked on as best I could....

[Rostarchuk] After all, being a financier does not run in your family?

[Pavlov] No, my father was a driver, and my mother a nurse.

[Rostarchuk] Have any of your children followed in your footsteps?

[Pavlov] My son has graduated from a finance institute, and he is a banker now.

[Rostarchuk] Let us hope that he belongs to the new breed of "Red Bankers."

[Pavlov] Time will tell.

Georgian Economic Sovereignty Plan Published

LD2009072189 Moscow TASS in English 0643 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Tbilisi September 20 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Alla Kokaya:

The draft of the fundamental principles of Soviet Georgia's economic sovereignty within the framework of the Soviet federation has been published by Georgian newspapers for a wide discussion. The document was prepared by prominent Georgian economists.

"Of course, this document contains only the basic and most important principles of a switchover to economic independence," Georgia's First Deputy Prime Minister, Otar Kvilitaya said. "The draft outlines different forms of property relations in Georgia, determines the lower echelons of economic management, points out sources of replenishing Georgia's state budget and offers a new taxation system. This is what Georgia needs for independent economic activities within the Soviet federation," Kvilitaya continued.

Besides, the draft formulates for the first time the principles of the Georgian demographic, ecological and foreign economic policy. In short, it covers practicaly all spheres which will help the republic to raise its economy to a qualitatively new level.

The draft's discussion will involve all strata of Georgia's population. Opinions are divided over some problems mentioned in the document. All points of view will be

taken into account so that the general position could be worked out and decisions suiting everybody could be made.

Georgia is planning to switch over to economic independence in the beginning of 1991.

Defense Industries Striving for Foreign Trade

LD1609133989 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 16 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 16 TASS—The defence industries of the Soviet economy are fully determined to trade actively with foreign countries, Valeriy Mikhaylov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, said in an interview with the weekly NTR [expansion unknown]. Cooperative and commercial relations of defence ministries with the outside world ran quite recently into serious difficulties due to extreme secrecy of their operations and absence of the right to direct contacts with foreign firms, he noted. Nevertheless, the defence complex begins its foreign trade operations not from scratch. It has some experience in this field.

Mikhaylov cited as an example the activities of the USSR Ministry of Defence Industry which is the leading producer of optics for the civil sector. These are photo and cine equipment, observation, spectral and other instruments. The ministry has been for many years a permanent exhibitor at the International Photo and Cine Exposition held in Cologne every next year. Western specialists displayed great interest in Soviet holograms at the latest show last year. Contracts were concluded at the exhibition to supply Soviet optical products to various countries. Some West German firms also concluded contracts with the ministry to develop various technologies, including those to machine optical parts.

The deputy chairman noted that the defence industries participate more actively in international scientific and technical events. They took part in a travelling exhibition in Italian and West German cities last June. As a result, they concluded contracts and agreements to sell licenses and organise joint production. An understanding was reached to hold talks on mounting an exhibition of Soviet scientific and technical achievements in Japan in 1991, including the participation of the defence industries.

Speaking of the defence industries' potentialities in foreign economic cooperation, Mikhaylov pointed, above all, to achievements which resulted in the development of the Energiya-Buran space system. The industries offered to the civil sector over 600 sophisticated technologies, tested technical means and new materials. According to the deputy chairman, many billions in profits can be netted from this source alone.

Military

Border Guards Directorate Marks 50th Anniversary

Praised by Central Committee

PM1909150189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[Undated CPSU Central Committee message to USSR KGB Border Guards personnel]

[Text] To the Military Councils, political organs, commanders, political workers, and all personnel of the USSR KGB Border Guards.

The CPSU Central Committee warmly congratulates the Military Councils, political organs, commanders, political workers, and all personnel on the 50th anniversary of the formation of the USSR KGB Border Guards Political Directorate.

The creation of the Political Directorate in September 1939 at the decision of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee completed the process of forming a unified system of political organs in the Border Guards, which, at all stages of their development, have persistently implemented party policy and party decisions on questions concerning the defense of the fatherland's sacred borders.

The multifaceted work of the political organs played an important role in ensuring the protection of the Soviet state's borders in the difficult prewar years, when the servicemen in green caps waged a brave, selfless struggle against imperialist intelligence agents, saboteurs, and economic smugglers. Commissars, political workers, and communists were in the front lines of the border guards who entered into combat with the fascist invaders on 22 June 1941. During the Great Patriotic War years they fostered courage and heroism in servicemen with their impassioned party message and personal example and instilled in their hearts an unshakable belief in victory over the enemy.

Today the Border Guards are working in the conditions of the renewal of all spheres of life in Soviet society. The tasks of protecting the Soviet state border, which stem from the party's foreign policy directives, require cardinal restructuring of the forms and methods of military service work, further strengthening of socialist legality in the forces' activity, and the creation of the most favorable conditions for our country's constantly expanding international ties.

This places great responsibility on Military Councils, political organs, and party organizations. They are expected to master political methods of leadership, develop glasnost, strengthen close ties with people, enhance border guards' political activity, and educate them in a spirit of patriotism, internationalism, and commitment to their military and civic duty.

One topical task facing them is to strengthen the traditional friendship with the population of the border regions and contribute to implementing the basic principles of the party's national policy in present-day conditions.

The CPSU Central Committee expresses the strong belief that Military Councils, political organs, commanders, and political workers will continue to actively implement the party's restructuring course and do everything necessary to reliably protect the state border of the Soviet Union, enhance combat readiness, and strengthen discipline and organization.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee.

Lizichev Attends Ceremonial Meeting

PM2009084189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Sep 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Ceremonial Meeting"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of representatives of the capital's working people, USSR KGB Border Troops personnel, and Moscow Garrison servicemen devoted to the 50th anniversary of the USSR KGB Border Troops Political Directorate was held in Moscow 15 September.

Participating in the meeting's work were Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; F.D. Bobkov, first deputy chairman of the USSR KGB; V.A. Ponomarev, deputy chairman of the USSR KGB; Army General V.A. Matrosov, deputy chairman of the USSR KGB and chief of the USSR KGB Border Troops; and Lieutenant General N.V. Britvin, member of the Military Council and chief of the USSR KGB Border Troops Political Directorate.

It was pointed out at the meeting that the Border Troops political workers make a great contribution to educating personnel and ensuring the reliable defense of the socialist motherland's borders.

Preliminary Findings on Sub Reactor Failure Noted

PM1909101789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Sep 89 First Edition p 4

[Report by Captain 3d Rank P. Ishchenko: "Reactor Cooled"]

[Text] Northern Fleet—The preliminary results of the work of the commission charged with establishing the causes of the nuclear reactor accident that occurred aboard a Northern Fleet submarine in the region of Bear Island 26 June are now known.

Let us recall that the the reactor loop's hermetic seal was ruptured, which required the main power unit to be closed down. The most likely cause of the accident, according to specialists' findings, is an ingress of seawater into the first loop's duct. It is hypothesized that its penetration was due to a hairline fracture in the duct of the seawater system cooling the auxiliary mechanisms. A second scenario is not yet being discounted: that the first loop's seal failure was caused by the unsoundness of a welded joint in the duct—welding was carried out during manufacturer's overhaul prior to the submarine's departure on voyage. According to Captain 1st Rank Yu. Magakov, acting chief of the fleet technical administration, it will only be possible to make a "diagnosis" after the pipes have undergone special laboratory analyis.

Order is now being restored in the compartments aboard the submarine and chemical services specialists are continuing work. The submarine's future is clear: It will be taken out of service next year in accordance with proposals already made.

"After the accident we checked the technical condition of all first-generation nuclear submarines," Captain 1st Rank N. Peregudov, chief of department in the technical directorate, said. "Moreover, we have prepared a special information report based on the results of the commission's work and distributed it to all our fleet nuclear submarine units and combined units and higher naval colleges and educational subunits training specialists for nuclear vessels. It lays down, in particular, organizational and technical measures to give warning of and guard against such occurrences."